

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 89-435

H. R. 14215

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 14215.....	1
Digest of Public Law 89-435.....	2





## INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 14215

Mar. 31, 1966 H. Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 14215.  
H. Rept. 1405. Print of bill and report.

Apr. 5, 1966 House completed debate on H. R. 14215.

Apr. 6, 1966 House passed H. R. 14215 with amendment.

Apr. 13, 1966 H. R. 14215 was referred to Senate Appropriations  
Committee. Print of bill as referred.

Apr. 25, 1966 Senate subcommittee approved H. R. 14215.

May 10, 1966 Senate committee reported H. R. 14215 with amend-  
ments. S. Rept. 1154. Print of bill and report.

May 12, 1966 Senate passed H. R. 14215 with amendments.

Senate conferees were appointed. Print of bill as  
passed by Senate.

May 16, 1966 House conferees were appointed.

May 17, 1966 House received conference report. H. Rept. 1538.  
Print of report.

May 18, 1966 House agreed to conference report.

May 19, 1966 Senate agreed to conference report.

May 31, 1966 Approved: Public Law 89-435



DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 89-435

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1967. Provides funds for the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, National Park Service, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Indian Affairs, etc.



FO

HOUSE

1. FOOD FOR INDIA. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. J. Res. 997, to support U. S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people (H. Rept. 1408) (p. 7000). Rep. Albert stated this resolution will be taken up under motion to suspend the rules on Mon. (p. 6968). Rep. Green, Ore., commended the measure and inserted items commending the President's message on food for India (pp. 6992-3).



# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued April 1, 1966  
For actions of March 31, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 56

### CONTENTS

Adjournment.....14	G I benefits.....24	Recreation.....35
Animal research.....28	Hides.....10	Roads and trails.....9,35
Appropriations....12,13,27	Inflation.....20	Ryukyu Islands.....4
Butter.....33	Land and Water Conservation Fund.....13	Reclamation.....16,30
Cattle hides.....10	Lands.....9,34,35	Research.....28
Child nutrition.....8	Legislative program.....12	School lunch.....18
Defense production.....5	Loans.....3,15	School milk.....7,18,31
Economic council.....29	Milk.....7,18,31	Small business.....3
Education.....21	Minimum wage.....22	Soil conservation.....6
Farm loans.....15	Opinion poll.....19	Soybeans.....17
Food for India.....1,12	Pay.....2,12	Tobacco.....11
Foreign aid.....4	Personnel.....2,12,32,36	Water research.....23
Forest Service.....12,13	Prices.....29	Water resources.....26
GAO reports.....25		Watersheds.....27

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House committee reported food for India resolution. House committee reported Interior appropriation bill (includes Forest Service). House committee voted to report Federal pay-fringe benefits bill. Rep. Trimble criticized Soil Conservation Service budget cuts. Rep. Multer urged permanent school milk program. Rep. Resnick commended proposed child nutrition program. House subcommittee voted to report bill to authorize economic emergency loans to farmers.

### HOUSE

1. **FOOD FOR INDIA.** The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. J. Res. 997, to support U. S. participation in relieving victims of hunger in India and to enhance India's capacity to meet the nutritional needs of its people (H. Rept. 1408) (p. 7000). Rep. Albert stated this resolution will be taken up under motion to suspend the rules on Mon. (p. 6968). Rep. Green, Ore., commended the measure and inserted items commending the President's message on food for India (pp. 6992-3).



2. PERSONNEL; PAY. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 14122, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain Federal employees (p. D279). The committee was granted permission to report the bill by midnight Apr. 1 (p. 6948). Rep. Albert stated the bill will be taken up under motion to suspend the rules on Mon. (p. 6968).
3. SMALL BUSINESS. By a vote of 372 to 0, passed with amendments S. 2729, to increase by \$125 million the authorization of the Small Business Administration for the amount of loans and commitments that may be outstanding in its regular business loan program, disaster loan program, prime contract authority, and title IV loans under the Economic Opportunity Act. pp. 6949-67
4. FOREIGN AID. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 12617, to provide additional funds for the economic and social development of the Ryukyu Islands (H. Rept. 1406). p. 7000
5. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The Banking and Currency Committee was granted permission to file a report by midnight, Apr. 2, on H. R. 14025, to extend the Defense Production Act. p. 6948
6. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Trimble criticized budget cuts for the Soil Conservation Service, particularly for soil surveys and "the limitations for watershed planning and watershed construction starts." pp. 6969-70
7. SCHOOL MILK. Rep. Multer criticized the school milk program budget cut and urged enactment of legislation to provide a permanent school milk program. p. 6986
8. CHILD NUTRITION. Rep. Resnick commended the proposed Child Nutrition Act of 1966, particularly the proposed pilot breakfast program for school children. p. 6988
9. LANDS. Received from Interior a proposed bill "to establish a nationwide system of trails"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 7000
10. CATTLE HIDES. Reps. Edmondson and Andrews, N. Dak., criticized the imposition of export quotas on cattle hides by the Commerce Department. pp. 6947, 6948
11. TOBACCO. Rep. Kornegay criticized the speech of the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission critical of cigarette advertising practices of the broadcast industry. p. 6972
12. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert stated that the food for India resolution and the Federal pay-fringe benefits bill will be considered Mon. under motions to suspend the rules, and the Private Calendar will be called and the Interior appropriation bill will be considered Tues. He stated any roll call votes on Mon. and Tues. will be put over until Wed. pp. 6968-9
13. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967. The Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 14215 (H. Rept. 1405), which includes items for the Forest Service as shown in the table at the end of this Digest. Excerpts from the Committee report are also attached. The bill includes appropriations for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which provides \$13,093,000



for Forest Service land acquisition under the fund. The budget estimates proposed \$13,170,000.

14. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 4. p. 7000

SENATE

15. FARM LOANS. A subcommittee of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report for full committee consideration S. 2822, to amend various provisions of the laws administered by the Farm Credit Administration to improve operations thereunder, and S. 1126, to amend the emergency loan authority of the Secretary of Agriculture under subtitle C of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 to authorize such loans in areas where credit is not otherwise available because of serious economic conditions for farmers or ranchers. p. D276

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

16. RECLAMATION. Speech in the House by Rep. Aspinall urging approval of H. R. 2829, authorizing the operation of the Manson unit, Chelan division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Wash. p. A1863-4

17. SOYBEANS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Latta stating that "Secretary Freeman has announced that soybeans can be planted under provisions of the 1966 feed grain program," and commending his district for its soybean production. p. A1865

18. SCHOOL LUNCH; MILK. Rep. Sisk inserted a Calif. Legislature resolution urging Congress "to restore the \$3 million cut in the current budget for the special milk program and to increase the proposed appropriations...for the school lunch program." p. A1867

19. OPINION POLL. Rep. Mailliard inserted the results of a questionnaire including items of interest to this Department. pp. A1867-8

20. INFLATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bob Wilson stating that the shoe industry's reported intention to raise the price of shoes is "another increase in the cost of living--a trend that is becoming a habit under the great high society," and that the Government should "set an example of fiscal responsibility." p. A1866

Rep. Arends inserted an article, "Effects of the Rise in Living Costs. p. A1870

21. EDUCATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Green, Oreg., commending and inserting a speech given at a conference on Federal programs in health, education, and welfare, "Local and State Responsibilities in the Federal Programs." pp. A1871-3

22. MINIMUM WAGE. Rep. Belcher inserted an article, "Minimum Wage Laws Assailed," which states that "minimum wage laws are a real economic inequity." p. A1874

23. WATER RESEARCH. Speech in the House by Rep. Aspinall urging enactment of H. R. 3606, the water research bill. pp. A1880-1

24. GI BENEFITS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Quillen commending passage of the cold war GI bill and inserting Cmdr. Frith's comments on the implementation of this bill. pp. A1864-5
25. GAO REPORTS. Rep. Dole inserted an article, "Watchdog Getting Teeth Pulled," critical of alleged withholding of GAO reports. p. A1875

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. WATER RESOURCES. H. R. 14192 by Rep. Hamilton, granting the consent of Congress to a Great Lakes Basin compact; to Foreign Affairs Committee.  
H. R. 14194 by Rep. Howard, to provide for a comprehensive review of national water resource problems and programs; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
27. WATERSHEDS. H. J. Res. 1003 by Rep. Callan and H. J. Res. 1007 by Rep. Hansen, expressing the intent of the Congress with respect to appropriations for watershed planning for fiscal year 1966; to Appropriations Committee. Remarks of Rep. Hansen, pp. 6990-1
28. RESEARCH ANIMALS. H. R. 14178 by Rep. Ashbrook, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation; to Agriculture Committee.
29. PRICES. H. R. 14186 by Rep. Fino, to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for a Minority Economic Council; to Government Operations Committee. Remarks of author p. A1867
30. RECLAMATION. H. R. 14202 by Rep. Moss, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the initial phase of the east side division, Central Valley project, California; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
31. MILK. H. R. 14203 by Rep. Multer, to provide a permanent special milk program for children; to Agriculture Committee.
32. PERSONNEL. H. R. 14212 by Rep. Schisler, to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of the Federal Government; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
33. BUTTER. H. R. 14213 by Rep. Stratton, to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that the daily ration of members of the Army and Air Force contain at least as much butter as the daily ration prescribed for members of the Navy; to Armed Services Committee.
34. LANDS. H. R. 14218 by Rep. King, to provide for the lease of certain public lands for ponding and related purposes; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.
35. TRAILS; RECREATION. H. R. 14222 by Rep. Rivers, to establish a nationwide system of trails; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Remarks of author pp. A1875-6

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

36. PERSONNEL. H. R. 1647, to authorize payment of back pay and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government employees who were improperly deprived thereof by unwarranted personnel action. Approved March 30, 1966 (Public Law 89-380).

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS APR. 1:

War on hunger and CCC commodity reserve bills, H. Agriculture (exec).  
Stockpile program, H. Interior (exec).

oOo



EXCERPTS FROM HOUSE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE  
INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - FOREST SERVICE

Forest Protection and Utilization

Forest land management . . . . Total reductions of \$485,000 below the budget estimate include: \$100,000 for recreation facilities in Eastern United States; \$200,000 for mapping work in the examination and appraisal of land; \$85,000 planning funds for the Missoula Equipment Development Center; and \$100,000 for water development projects built by other agencies.

The amount recommended by the Committee also includes the following increases over the budget estimate: \$200,000 for water recreation facilities on the Middle Fork of Anderson River, Indiana; \$150,000 for improvements on Todd Lake and the Confederate Breastworks in the George Washington National Forest, Virginia; \$50,000 preplanning funds for the construction of a reservoir on the Upper Big River project, Merrimac River Basin, Missouri; and \$50,000 for engineering and recreational planning for the Lusk Creek Project in the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois.

Forest research . . . . Total decreases of \$482,000 below the budget estimate include \$150,000 for utilization of Appalachian timber; \$100,000 for harvesting and transporting Appalachian timber; \$182,000 for market research for forest products of Appalachia; and \$50,000 for forest recreation research.

The Committee is in accord with operations of the Forest Service to improve the economy in Appalachia. The reductions recommended in this bill results from evidence developed during the hearings that these programs are still slow in getting under way, and in each instance rather sizeable sums of funds appropriated for these activities in 1965 still remain unobligated. In the opinion of the Committee, the Bill as recommended provides sufficient funds in fiscal year 1967 to keep pace with the agency's ability to develop program operations.

The increases recommended by the Committee over the budget estimate include: \$72,000 planning for an addition to the forest insect and disease laboratory at Delaware, Ohio; and \$450,000 for the construction of a hydrology laboratory at Oxford, Mississippi.

The Committee is informed final plans for the Olympia Laboratory have not yet been completed. It is understood this is a high priority item with the Forest Service and construction funds will be budgeted as soon as the financial situation permits.

Also included are planning funds for the following Forest Research Laboratories: Corvallis, Oregon (\$170,000); La Grande, Oregon (\$28,000); Provo, Utah (\$37,000); Madison, Wisconsin (\$180,000); Nacogdoches, Texas (\$25,000); Berea, Kentucky (\$40,000).

Timber development, organization loans and technical assistance . . . . Of the \$50,000 for technical assistance and \$950,000 for loans and related expenses appropriated in fiscal year 1965, \$40,820 and \$900,000 remain unobligated as of January 31, 1966. Testimony developed during the hearings indicated that progress in this program will continue at a slow rate. In view of this, it is the opinion of the Committee that funds currently available for this program will be sufficient through fiscal year 1967.

EXCERPTS FROM HOUSE (cont.)

Use of Contract Personnel

Another area of concern to the Committee is the use of contract personnel and consultants. Apparently as a result of more restrictive limitations on regular personnel, there is a growing tendency to contract out work previously performed by regular personnel. There were instances in the hearings this year where witnesses admitted this procedure resulted, not only in lower quality but in higher cost for the work.

If this trend should continue, it could become a problem. The Committee, therefore, recommends that responsible administrative officials give this matter careful attention during the coming fiscal year and be prepared to give the Committee full justification for funds requested in the 1968 budget estimate for contract personnel.

Personnel costs for practically all of the agencies have increased during the past few years, both as a result of the pay increases and the employment of additional personnel to administer the additional duties assumed by the agencies. However, the Committee notes an increasing tendency to hire consultants to perform additional workload rather than using its own personnel who are paid good salaries to do the work. There are some instances where because of a specialized nature of the work, this is a logical and practical process. However, the Committee will look with disfavor on extension of this practice unless it is clearly demonstrated that regular employees cannot meet the requirement.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

Item	Estimated Available, 1966 <u>a/</u>	Budget Estimates, 1967	House Committee Bill 1967	Increase (+) or Decrease (-)
ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS:				
Forest protection and utilization:				
Forest land management <u>b/</u> .....	\$164,152,000	\$172,856,000	\$172,821,000	-\$35,000
Forest research .....	37,372,000	34,435,000	34,955,000	+520,000
State and private forestry cooperation .....	17,558,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	-
Total, Forest protection and utilization .....	219,082,000	225,188,000	225,673,000	+485,000
Forest roads and trails .....	102,136,000	102,530,000	101,230,000	-1,300,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:				
Special acts .....	80,000	80,000	80,000	-
Uinta National Forest .....	-	300,000	300,000	-
Cooperative range improvements .....	700,000	700,000	700,000	-
Assistance to States for tree planting .....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-
Timber development organization loans and technical assistance .....	-	500,000	-	-500,000
Total, Annual appropriations .....	322,098,000	330,298,000	328,983,000	-1,315,000
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS (Primarily "Payments to States and Territories" and "Roads and Trails for States" payable from national forest receipts) <u>d/</u> .....	57,268,000	60,950,000	60,950,000	-

- a/ Includes proposed supplemental appropriations for pay act costs as reflected in House Doc. No. 383 and House Doc. No. 405.
- b/ Includes contingency funds to the extent necessary as follows: (1) \$5,000,000 for emergency fire fighting and (2) \$1,910,000 for insect and disease control.
- c/ Excludes proposed supplemental appropriation of \$7,500,000 for fighting forest fires.
- d/ In addition, prior year balances available.



## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

MARCH 31, 1966.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the  
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. DENTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the  
following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 14215]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year 1967. The bill provides regular annual appropriations for the Department of the Interior (except Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration) and for other related agencies including the U.S. Forest Service.

### SUMMARY OF BILL

#### DIRECT APPROPRIATIONS

Appropriations, 1966 (to date)-----	\$1, 127, 760, 070
Appropriations, 1966, (includes anticipated pay supplemental)--	1, 139, 387, 070
Budget estimates, 1967-----	1, 204, 514, 500
Recommended in bill for 1967-----	1, 169, 703, 500
1967 bill compared with:	
Appropriations, 1966 (including anticipated pay supple-	
mental)-----	+30, 316, 430
Budget estimates, 1967-----	-34, 811, 000

In addition, the bill provides for the appropriation of \$125,446,000 in earmarked receipts, including \$110,000,000 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and an additional borrowing authorization of \$10,000,000 for the Helium Fund.

## REVENUES

The activities covered by the Bill are forecast to generate \$992,300,000 in Federal revenues in fiscal year 1967, as compared to \$758,800,000 in fiscal year 1966 and \$536,600,000 in fiscal year 1965.

## SUMMARY OF INCREASES AND DECREASES

Following is a summary of the major increases and decreases in the 1966 level which are discussed in detail below by appropriation item:

## Major increases:

For additional education and welfare services, and other assistance to the American Indian.....	+\$32, 550, 000
For additional management, protection, and maintenance costs in the National Parks.....	+4, 462, 000
For acceleration of the Solid Waste Disposal Program and Coal Research.....	+3, 600, 000
For Appalachian Region Area mining and fish and wildlife restoration projects.....	+9, 000, 000
For accelerating the Saline Water Research Program.....	+7, 366, 000
For additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service.....	+6, 288, 000
For construction, Rail Rapid Transit System...	+5, 376, 000
For additional operating and research of the Smithsonian Institution.....	+4, 886, 000
Subtotal, major increases.....	<u>+73, 528, 000</u>

## Major decreases:

Reduction in construction of facilities and roads..	-21, 093, 200
Nonrecurring items in 1966 Bill.....	-10, 000, 000
Reduction in requirements for Administration of Territories, primarily Guam.....	-4, 066, 000
Reduction in subsidies for construction of fishing vessels.....	-2, 000, 000
Reduction in level of funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities..	-3, 700, 000
Reduction in Bureau of Land Management operations.....	-1, 070, 000
Reduction in level of Wetlands Acquisition Program.....	-1, 500, 000
Subtotal, major decreases.....	<u>-43, 429, 200</u>

Other increases and decreases (net).....	<u>+217, 630</u>
Net total increase.....	<u>+30, 316, 430</u>



## EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN BILL

The extent of the activities that must be funded in this Bill is indicated by the following summary:

1. Management, conservation, development and protection of the forest, range, mineral and water resources on 464 million acres of the Nation's public domain lands; including grazing of over 10 million head of livestock and 2.8 million big game animals; sale of over 1½ billion board feet of timber; administration of mining and mineral leasing on 780 million acres in the continental United States and over 250 million acres of submerged lands of the outer continental shelf with estimated receipts of \$537 million in 1967.

2. Provision of educational assistance, facilities and services to 59,800 Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools and assistance to over 57,000 Indian children in the Public Schools; welfare and guidance services to 23,280 needy Indians; technical assistance and supervision for the development and construction of 1,200 low-rent and 800 Mutual-aid housing units on Indian reservations; management and protection of nearly 50 million acres of Indian-owned forest and range lands; construction, operation and maintenance of 300 irrigation systems serving about 864,000 acres; and maintenance of about 18,800 miles of roads on Indian reservations.

3. Management, protection, maintenance, and construction of facilities, including about 18,800 miles of parkways, roads and trails in 230 National Parks and other areas comprising about 26.4 million acres with an estimated 127.5 million visitors in 1967.

4. Provision under the Geological Survey for topographic surveys and mapping of the United States; geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping of the United States and of the Continental Shelf; financial assistance to private industry for exploration for critical minerals; investigations of the quantity and quality of the Nation's water resources and of basic hydrologic principles; and supervision of development and production of minerals and mineral fuels on leased Federal, Indian, and Outer Continental Shelf lands. The annual value of such production is \$1.7 billion, with royalties of over \$200 million.

5. Conservation, evaluation, and development of our mineral resources under the Bureau of Mines, including inspection of 8,000 coal mines, restoration work in the Appalachian region and the production, conservation and sale of the Nation's helium.

6. The conduct of research, management, and demonstration programs to conserve and restore fish and wildlife resources for both recreational and commercial use, including the operation and maintenance of 90 fish hatcheries and 304 National wildlife refuges consisting of 28.5 million acres.

7. The management, protection, and development of 186 million acres of land in the National Forests and Grasslands, including an estimated harvest of 11.6 billion board feet of timber in 1967 with a value of \$146.4 million; provision of recreation facilities for an estimated 169 million visitors; grazing for 6 million livestock; construction of 1,605 miles of roads and 750 miles of trails; maintenance of about 188,133 miles of roads and 102,947 miles of trails; rehabilitation and restoration of forest watersheds to improve water quality and yield; research directed primarily toward the growth and harvesting of timber, its protection from fire, insects, and diseases, and the protec-

tion and management of watersheds; and cooperation with states in fire control, tree planting, and forest management and processing.

### LAND ACQUISITION

The Committee is seriously concerned with developments in the land acquisition program under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Fundamentally, the Committee endorses the idea of the acquisition of various land areas within the Nation for the preservation of natural scenic beauty, the provision of recreation areas for our increasing population, and the preservation of wildlife habitat. In the opinion of the Committee, the enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Act to accomplish this purpose provided a very logical and practical arrangement.

However, the Committee is increasingly perturbed at the escalation of land prices in areas designated for acquisition under the Land and Water Conservation Fund act as the result of extensive operation of land speculators. The objectives of this program as mentioned heretofore are not the enrichment of those individuals who seek to capitalize on the Government's intention to achieve this objective.

The Committee has given serious thought to this problem and has discussed it with the director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in the hearings this year. Apparently there is no ready solution to the aggravating problem. Perhaps it will require a complete revision in our method of providing funds for the acquisition of these lands.

As the situation now exists, from the moment authorization is enacted to declare an area a National Park, wilderness, or other conservation unit, a period of from two to three years elapses before funds are available for the acquisition of this land and the agency has completed the long drawn out and involved negotiations for the purchase of the land. In the meantime, the land speculators have entered the picture, and by the time the Government is in a position to purchase the land, the land prices have increased in many cases from two to three hundred percent over what they were prior to the designation of the area for Federal acquisition.

The Government does have recourse to condemnation proceedings in these cases. However, testimony before the Committee has been to the effect that when acquisition of land progresses to condemnation action the Government finds itself in a position of paying inordinately more for the land than it was worth a few years previous, and in many cases, more than it could have been acquired for through informal negotiation with the owner.

The Committee was pleased to note that the President, in his conservation message to Congress, warned that "land for the use of the general public should not be burdened with the increased price resulting from speculative activities." He called on several agencies to look for ways to protect the Government from "artificial price spirals." It is the feeling of the Committee however, that effective action to correct this undesirable situation must be taken at the earliest moment.

Without exception, these federal land acquisitions will be beneficial to local surrounding areas. The committee feels that local jurisdictions should cooperate in preventing the unwarranted increases in land prices by exercising their local zoning authorities to a greater extent.

The Committee requests that the Department of Interior give this matter their immediate attention with a view to proposing remedial legislation at the earliest possible moment that will more effectively protect the interests of the Government in this connection.

This Committee will be glad to cooperate in any way possible to achieve this objective. It would be most regrettable if in the near future the Committee found it necessary to refuse the recommendation of any additional funding for this program because of the unwarranted escalation in land prices which attended the Government's interest in various areas of the country.

#### USE OF CONTRACT PERSONNEL

Another area of concern to the Committee is the use of contract personnel and consultants. Apparently as a result of more restrictive limitations on regular personnel, there is a growing tendency to contract out work previously performed by regular personnel. There were instances in the hearings this year where witnesses admitted this procedure resulted, not only in lower quality but in higher cost for the work.

If this trend should continue, it could become a problem. The Committee, therefore, recommends that responsible administrative officials give this matter careful attention during the coming fiscal year and be prepared to give the Committee full justification for funds requested in the 1968 budget estimate for contract personnel.

Personnel costs for practically all of the agencies have increased during the past few years, both as a result of the pay increases and the employment of additional personnel to administer the additional duties assumed by the agencies. However, the Committee notes an increasing tendency to hire consultants to perform additional workload rather than using its own personnel who are paid good salaries to do the work. There are some instances where because of a specialized nature of the work, this is a logical and practical process. However, the Committee will look with disfavor on extension of this practice unless it is clearly demonstrated that regular employees cannot meet the requirement.

#### LIMITATION ON UNIT COST OF EMPLOYEE HOUSING

The Committee is continuing in fiscal year 1967 its policy of limiting the unit cost of employee housing (regardless of the source of financing) in the United States, including Alaska and Hawaii and the territories



to \$20,000. The limitation includes engineering and design costs, but excludes provision of utilities to the lot line. Any exceptions to this monetary limitation shall continue to be submitted to the Committee for its advance review and approval. Employee houses shall not exceed the standards outlined by the Committee in its Report No. 2049, 87th Congress, 2d Session.

## TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

#### MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$49,575,000
Estimate, 1967.....	48,755,000
Recommended, 1967.....	48,755,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	—820,000
Estimate, 1967.....	

The amount allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1966 appropriation and the 1967 budget estimate is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 approp- riation	Estimate, 1967
Realty and mineral leasing services:			
Title, lease and records service.....	\$5,166,000	—\$22,010	
Records improvement.....	771,000	+12,500	
Total.....	5,937,000	—9,510	
Resource management conservation and protection:			
Land classification and mineral examination.....	4,473,000	—190,000	
Range management.....	5,389,000	—51,500	
Forestry.....	6,836,000	+66,800	
Soil and watershed conservation.....	14,777,000	—238,000	
Fire protection.....	3,437,000	+128,000	
Total.....	34,912,000	—284,700	
Cadastral survey:			
Alaska.....	1,691,000	—290,000	
Other States.....	3,087,000	+47,000	
Total.....	4,778,000	—243,000	
Firefighting and rehabilitation.....	1,000,000	—250,000	
General administration.....	2,128,000	+13,000	
Transfers in the estimates.....		—45,790	
Total.....	48,755,000	—820,000	

#### CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$3,150,000
Estimate, 1967.....	2,900,000
Recommended, 1967.....	2,900,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	—250,000
Estimate, 1967.....	

The amount allowed includes \$500,000 for the completion of the Anchorage fire station; \$100,000 for investigation and design of a major fire center at Boise, Idaho; \$750,000 for construction of sanitation and protection facilities; \$550,000 for maintenance of buildings

and sanitation and protection facilities; and \$1,000,000 for maintenance of roads.

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Appropriation, 1966	\$2, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967	2, 000, 000
Recommended, 1967	2, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	
Estimate, 1967	

This appropriation is required to liquidate the obligations incurred under the contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act, 1962, for development of roads and trails on the public lands.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

The Bill continues the indefinite appropriation of 25 percent of the gross receipts from sales of timber and other products, representing one-third of the 75 percent of the revenues due the Oregon and California counties. It is estimated that a total of \$9,750,000 will be available in 1967 for the construction, acquisition, and operation and maintenance of access roads and improvements, and for forest protection and development on the revested lands and on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant Counties of Oregon.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

Appropriation, 1966	\$107, 048, 000
Estimate, 1967	115, 296, 000
Recommended, 1967	114, 475, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	+7, 427, 000
Estimate, 1967	-821, 000

The amount allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1966 appropriation, and the estimate for 1967 is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
Educational assistance facilities and services	\$82, 709, 000	+\$6, 635, 000	-\$600, 000
Welfare and guidance services	13, 899, 000	+387, 000	-10, 000
Relocation and adult vocational training	14, 973, 000	+460, 480	-211, 000
Maintaining law and order	2, 894, 000	-44, 000	
Transfers in the estimate		-11, 480	
Total, Education and Welfare Services	114, 475, 000	+7, 427, 000	-821, 000

The amount allowed is \$821,000 below the budget estimate. The net decrease consists of a reduction of \$221,000 in the amount included in the estimate for increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions; \$400,000 of the increase requested for grants to Indian college students; and \$200,000 of the increase requested to provide for additional trainees in vocational training.

The reduction recommended by the Committee pertaining to higher education is not intended as a desire to reduce or retard this program in any way. The Committee fully endorses the encouragement of Indian youths to participate in the higher education programs and recommends the reduction solely on the basis that funds available for this activity, even after the reduction in the requested increase, will be adequate in fiscal year 1967 when other sources of financial assistance are taken into consideration.

The committee recommends that the Agricultural Extension program in Oklahoma be funded at a \$100,000 level in 1967 with funds reprogramed from the Mutual Help and Low-Rent Housing program.

#### RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$43,365,000
Estimate, 1967.....	44,611,000
Recommended, 1967.....	44,086,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+721,000
Estimate, 1967.....	-525,000

The amount allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1966 appropriation and the 1967 budget estimate is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
Forest and range lands.....	\$5,224,000	—\$53,000	—\$35,000
Fire suppression.....	140,000		
Agricultural and industrial assistance.....	7,592,000	+249,000	—44,000
Soil and moisture conservation.....	5,248,000	—253,000	—35,000
Maintenance of roads.....	3,887,000	+83,000	—4,000
Development of Indian arts and crafts.....	374,000	+2,000	
Management of Indian trust property.....	6,780,000	—122,000	—49,000
Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities.....	13,631,000	+900,696	—357,000
Operation, repair, and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems.....	1,210,000	—70,000	—1,000
Transfers in the estimates.....		—15,696	
Total, Resources Management.....	44,086,000	+721,000	—525,000

The decrease of \$525,000 recommended by the committee consists of a reduction of \$205,000 in the request for the increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions, and a reduction of \$320,000 in the request for maintenance of new facilities.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$35,151,000
Estimate, 1967.....	57,164,000
Recommended, 1967.....	55,325,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+20,174,000
Estimate, 1967.....	—1,839,000

The Committee, with the exception of fall-out shelters, recommends approval of the construction program proposed for fiscal year 1967. However, a reduction of \$2,000,000 in the amount of funding is recommended based on anticipated slippage in the construction program.

An additional \$129,000 has been deleted for fall-out shelters planned for schools for which construction has been approved. The Committee does not see the need for this expenditure in the areas where it is proposed.



The Committee recommends an increase of \$100,000 for continued planning and design of a high school at Sisseton, South Dakota, and \$25,000 for an elementary school at Peever, South Dakota, to serve students from the Sisseton Indian Reservation.

The Committee has also included the amount of \$165,000 for the second phase of construction of Black Lake Dam, Montana.

The Committee is of the strong opinion that actual construction should be expedited to the fullest possible extent on the Eufaula Boarding School, Eufaula, Oklahoma, for which \$37,000 is included in the Bill for planning. To the extent that construction work can be initiated on a practical basis during fiscal year 1967, the Committee will be inclined to give favorable consideration to a proposal by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the reprogramming of funds in the amount of \$75,000 to accomplish this purpose.

#### ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$17, 445, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	16, 754, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	16, 754, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	—691, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

The recommended appropriation is required to liquidate the obligations incurred for Indian road construction under the contract authorization provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$4, 623, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	4, 677, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	4, 623, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	
Estimate, 1967-----	—54, 000

The Committee has disallowed the requested increase of \$54,000 to provide services of a resources management assistant and pay costs for 1966 positions. With the increase of \$167,800 of administrative expenses to be charged to program activities, it is the opinion of the Committee that the request of \$54,000 for an additional direct appropriation can be absorbed.

#### BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$3, 466, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	3, 910, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	3, 910, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+444, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

The Committee is concerned about the extremely low volume of sales of the annual recreation permit, and is of the opinion that this is caused in large part because the public generally is not familiar with how it works, where it may be used, where it may be purchased, and the benefits to be derived from the purchase of such an annual passport into Federal recreations areas. The Committee expects the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to be more aggressive in informing the public regarding these matters and other related fees and charges at Federal recreation areas.

The Committee expects the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and other agencies to work out effective arrangements between the Land and Water Conservation Fund program and other programs enacted by the Congress providing financial assistance for recreation. The Committee has reference to the Appalachian Regional Development Act, the Cropland Adjustment program in the Department of Agriculture authorized by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. Accordingly, the Committee requests the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to report to the Committee within three months as to the progress that has been made in achieving this coordination.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in connection with the preparation of the Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan, as directed by the Congress, has recently completed an inventory of public and privately owned recreation lands. There needs to be effective coordination and prevention of duplication between the Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan and the proposed recreation survey of rural lands by the Soil Conservation Service. Accordingly, the Committee requests a joint statement from the Soil Conservation Service and the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation explaining the relationship between these two surveys and outlining what arrangements need to be made to insure that the Soil Conservation Service survey supplements and aids the Nationwide Outdoor Recreation Plan.

The Committee directs the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to initiate an effective system of audits and inspections on State acquisition and development projects.

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

##### (APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$125, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	110, 000, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	110, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	— 15, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-----



The Committee recommends approval of the budget request of \$110,000,000, with certain exceptions, as follows:

Activity	Budget estimate	Committee bill, 1967	Change
1. Assistance to States.....	\$64, 440, 000	\$76, 203, 000	+\$11, 763, 000
2. Federal land acquisition program:			
National Park Service: Requirements for recently authorized areas:			
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Pa. and N.J.....	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	
Piscataway Park, Md.....	544, 500		-544, 500
Fire Island National Seashore, N.Y.....	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	
Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, Calif.....	1, 425, 000	1, 425, 000	
Assateague Island National Seashore, Md.....	3, 360, 000	3, 360, 000	
Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass.....	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	
Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho.....	440, 000	440, 000	
Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, Ariz.....	312, 500	312, 500	
Great Falls (George Washington Memorial Parkway), Virginia.....	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa.....	630, 000	630, 000	
Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr.....	231, 200	231, 200	
Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mo.....	400, 000	400, 000	
Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz.....	142, 000	142, 000	
Canyonlands National Park, Utah.....	14, 500	14, 500	
Ft. Scott National Historic Site, Kans.....		200, 000	+200, 000
Subtotal, new areas.....	15, 499, 700	15, 155, 200	-344, 500
Redwood National Park, Calif.....	10, 000, 000		-10, 000, 000
Inholdings in 9 park areas.....	2, 816, 300	2, 816, 300	
Total, Park Service.....	28, 316, 000	17, 971, 500	-10, 344, 500
Forest Service:			
Wilderness areas.....	432, 050	355, 050	-77, 000
Primitive areas.....	26, 200	26, 200	
Other recreation areas.....	12, 711, 750	12, 711, 750	
Total, Forest Service.....	13, 170, 000	13, 093, 000	-77, 000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:			
Endangered species: Florida Sandhill crane.....	1, 335, 000		-1, 335, 000
Recreation areas.....	179, 000	172, 500	-6, 500
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	1, 514, 000	172, 500	-1, 341, 500
Total, Federal program.....	43, 000, 000	31, 237, 000	-11, 763, 000
Administrative expenses.....	2, 560, 000	2, 560, 000	
Total, 1967.....	110, 000, 000	110, 000, 000	

### National Park Service

The reduction of \$10,544,500 in the Federal Land Acquisition Program of the National Park Service consists of the following:

1. Redwood National Park, California.....	-\$10, 000, 000
2. Piscataway Park, Maryland.....	-544, 500
Total.....	-10, 544, 500

The action of the Committee in recommending the reduction of \$10,000,000 for the Redwood National Park is not to be construed as an indication by the Committee of its disapproval of the proposal for the establishment of this Park. The reduction is recommended at this time solely on the basis that authorization for the establishment of this Park has not yet been enacted, and it is not the policy of this Committee to appropriate funds for such projects until adequate legislation has been enacted in connection therewith.

Likewise, the Committee's action in recommending the reduction of \$544,500 for land acquisition in Piscataway Park, Maryland, does not necessarily indicate the Committee's opposition to this proposal.

Proposed legislation is now pending, which if enacted would increase the ceiling on the appropriation of funds for this project. The Committee is of the opinion that in those instances where legislation is pending on certain land acquisition projects, the appropriation of funds should not precede the policy guidelines to be established by the authorizing committee.

The Committee has approved an increase of \$200,000 for the acquisition of land at Fort Scott National Historical Site, Kansas.

#### *Forest Service*

The recommended reduction of \$77,000 in the land acquisition program of the Forest Service relates to a tract proposed for acquisition in the Selway-Bitterroot wilderness area in Idaho. The Committee is not convinced that the acquisition of this land which includes relatively high improvement costs is practical or necessary at this time.

The Committee notes that the Forest Service has not succeeded in purchasing the Sylvania tract in the Ottawa National Forest. Should efforts to purchase this tract not reach a successful stage before July 1, 1966, the Committee will expect the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to reprogram the funds previously planned for Sylvania to the purchase of other tracts by the Forest Service. The Committee will then expect negotiations for the purchase of Sylvania to proceed with funds herein appropriated.

#### *Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife*

The Committee recommends deletion of \$1,335,000 requested by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for the acquisition of 7,040 acres for a Sandhill Crane refuge in Florida; and \$6,500 for the Willapa tract in Washington.

Testimony developed during the hearing indicated these cranes are now using about 25 percent of a 145,000-acre refuge in the Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge in Louisiana. The estimated population of the Sandhill Crane, according to testimony in the hearings, is somewhere between 700 and 2,000.

Information developed by the Committee indicated that the appraised value of the acreage in the Willapa tract was considerably in excess of what the actual value of this land should be. Therefore the Committee has deleted this acreage pending a reappraisal of the actual value of the land and the actual need for the acquisition of this tract.

### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND POLICY

With respect to the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation's consideration of acquisition proposals by the Federal agencies, the Committee expects the Bureau to pay particular attention to tracts that have a high cost per acre or substantial costs for improvements. The Committee further expects first priority be given to Federal acquisitions which will implement recent authorizations of the Congress and lower priority to acquisitions of lands within existing units of the National Park Service.

### ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

The Committee is of the opinion that an improper balance exists between positions and funds in the administrative expense activity of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is the view of the

Committee that the Bureau should reduce the amount of work proposed to be performed by contract, and employ approximately 35 employees over and above the number provided in the budget estimate to administer the expected volume of work. No increase would be required to accomplish this.

# OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

## ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$14, 579, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	10, 513, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	10, 513, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-4, 066, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	

This item makes provision for the expenses of the Office of Territories and for support of the Governments of the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

The amount allowed includes \$608,000 for the Guam rehabilitation program, and \$9,149,000 for American Samoa. Total funding for Guam rehabilitation in fiscal year 1967 will be \$5,503,000 due to the availability of carryover funds from 1966 amounting to \$4,895,000, that remain unobligated in connection with the Urban Renewal Program which was not approved by the Guam legislature.

The Committee has approved the budgeted construction programs as submitted. Because of the difficulty of accurately estimating the cost of individual construction projects in remote areas, the Committee will permit the incurrence of actual costs which are not in excess of 15 percent of the budget estimate.

## TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$17, 447, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	17, 494, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	17, 494, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+47, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	

The amount recommended is \$6,000 below the full annual amount authorized by Public Law 87-541, and will permit continuation of the accelerated development program in the fields of education, health, public works, and resources management.

## GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

### SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$73, 190, 870
Estimate, 1967.....	73, 920, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	72, 782, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-408, 870
Estimate, 1967.....	-1, 138, 000



The amount allowed by activities as compared with the 1966 appropriation and the estimate for 1967 is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
Topographic surveys and mapping.....	\$22,686,000	—\$554,000	—\$400,000
Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping.....	18,793,000	—77,780	-----
Minerals exploration.....	421,000	—343,090	-----
Marine geology and hydrology.....	862,000	+2,000	-----
Water resources investigations.....	23,178,000	+559,000	—638,000
Soil and moisture conservation.....	201,000	-----	-----
Conservation of lands and minerals.....	4,693,000	+9,000	—100,000
General administration.....	1,948,000	—4,000	-----
Total, Geological Survey.....	72,782,000	—408,870	—1,138,000

The reduction of \$400,000 below the budget estimate for "Topographic Surveys and Mapping" relates to the accelerated program of mapping in Appalachia for which the budget estimate provided an increase of \$500,000. In excess of \$99,000 is available for this activity in fiscal year 1966 and \$1,530,000 is included in the regular program for Appalachia in fiscal year 1967.

For "Water Resources Investigations" the Committee recommends a decrease of \$638,000 below the budget estimate. \$500,000 of this reduction relates to the requested increase of \$1,000,000 to match increased state offerings for cooperative investigations; \$100,000 of this reduction relates to the requested increase of \$225,000 to provide for flood plain mapping in Appalachia; and \$38,000 of the reduction relates to the increase requested for United States' participation in the International Hydrological Decade.

The reduction of \$100,000 recommended by the Committee under "Conservation of Lands and Minerals" relates to the requested increase of \$450,000 to provide for expanded workload created by increased prospection and production activity on Federal and Indian land, oil and gas, and mineral leases.

## BUREAU OF MINES

### CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$32,391,000
Estimate, 1967.....	31,466,000
Recommended, 1967.....	31,540,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	—851,000
Estimate, 1967.....	+74,000

The amount provided by activity compared with the 1966 appropriation and the estimate for 1967 is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
<b>Research:</b>			
Coal.....	\$6,590,000	+\$66,000	+\$300,000
Petroleum.....	2,125,000	-235,000	
Oil shale.....	1,309,000	+267,000	
Metallurgy.....	10,121,000	-352,000	
Mining.....	3,085,000	-41,000	
Marine mineral mining.....	235,000	+1,000	
Explosives.....	570,000	+3,000	
<b>Resource Development:</b>			
Statistics.....	1,803,000	-36,000	
Economic analysis.....	240,000	+9,000	-226,000
Bituminous coal.....	893,000	-96,000	
Anthracite.....	366,000	-41,000	
Petroleum.....	592,000	+4,000	
Minerals.....	3,054,000	-676,206	
International activities.....	557,000	-16,000	
Transfer in estimates.....		-7,794	
Carryover from prior year.....		+300,000	
<b>Total, Conservation and Development of Mineral Resources.....</b>	<b>31,540,000</b>	<b>-851,000</b>	<b>+74,000</b>

The net increase of \$300,000 under "Coal Research" is for investigation and research to develop a practical means of extinguishing smoldering fires in culm dumps in the State of Pennsylvania. These fires constitute a serious threat to the health of individuals in that vicinity and are causing considerable property damage. In the opinion of the Committee, it is imperative that a practical and feasible way to extinguish these fires be developed at the earliest possible moment.

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$226,000 in the amount requested under "Economic Analysis" to expand analyses of economic aspects of the minerals industry. \$240,000 would still be available for this activity in fiscal year 1967, and with the information available from the Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, and the Bureau of the Census, the Committee is of the opinion that the funds provided will be sufficient to meet the program requirements in fiscal year 1967.

#### HEALTH AND SAFETY

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$9,599,000
Estimate, 1967.....	9,390,000
Recommended, 1967.....	9,390,000
<b>Comparison:</b>	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-209,000
Estimate, 1967.....	

The net decrease of \$209,000 below the 1966 appropriation includes increases of \$79,000 to provide for increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions; and decreases of \$108,000 for control of fires in coal deposits, since funds for this activity are included in the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965; \$130,000 for non-recurring costs of equipment for roof-control research; and \$50,000 for non-recurring costs due to phasing out of the methane detection and monitoring research.

## SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1, 400, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	4, 335, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	4, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+2, 600, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-335, 000

The Committee recommends a reduction of \$335,000 in the amount requested to develop engineering data and contract for design, construction, and operation of demonstration plants for utilization of automobile scrap. Of the \$1,400,000 appropriated in fiscal year 1966 there was an unobligated balance of \$1,356,690 as of January 31, 1966. It is the opinion of the Committee that with these available funds, the reduction in funding for fiscal year 1967 will not adversely affect the progress on this project.

The amount provided in the Bill will fund the activities of this program as follows: Problem appraisal—\$200,000; scrap metal demonstration plants—\$2,265,000; utilization of processed solid waste—\$300,000; utilization of incinerator waste—\$260,000; recovery of alumina from red muds—\$175,000; and \$800,000 for demonstration grants.

## APPALACHIAN REGION MINING RESTORATION

Appropriation, 1966.....	
Estimate, 1967.....	\$10, 566, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	8, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+8, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-2, 566, 000

The total reduction of \$2,566,000 below the budget estimate includes a decrease of \$1,000,000 in the funds requested for continuation of projects for the sealing and filling of voids in abandoned coal mines; a decrease of \$1,000,000 in funds requested to provide for continuation of extinguishment and control of underground and outcrop fires; and a decrease of \$566,000 in the amount requested to provide for the conduct of additional projects for the reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mine areas.

The reductions recommended by the Committee in this connection should not be interpreted to reflect the Committee's dissatisfaction with or opposition to this important work. On the contrary, the Committee feels that program operations under this appropriation item are most worthy and needed, and it is the earnest hope of the Committee that marked progress will be achieved in this area during the next few years.

However, it was developed during the hearings that of the \$16,000,000 appropriated for this program in 1965, in excess of \$15,700,000 remained unobligated as of January 31, 1966. The agency indicated that \$9,000,000 of these funds would be utilized in 1966. The Committee appreciates this is a new program and it will take some time to get program operations organized. The reductions recommended herein are based solely on the Committee's estimate of the amount of funds that can be gainfully obligated in fiscal year 1967. Even with the reductions recommended by the Committee there will be approxi-



mately \$14,700,000 available for obligation in 1967, and this would appear to be the maximum amount of funding required for program development in the budget year.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$1, 551, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	1, 556, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	1, 556, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+5, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

The recommended net increase is to provide for increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions offset by a decrease to be accomplished by improved efficiency in operations.

#### HELIUM FUND

##### (BORROWING AUTHORIZATION)

Borrowing authority, 1966-----	\$16, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	26, 000, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	26, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+10, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

This borrowing authority is required to finance helium purchases under the existing contracts for the conservation of helium. Testimony developed during the hearings indicated that of the total \$52,000,000 in borrowing authority that has been made available, only \$5,000,000 will remain at the end of fiscal year 1966.

#### OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$7, 220, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	8, 237, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	8, 220, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+1, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-17, 000

This appropriation provides for contract research to develop new methods of mining, preparing, and utilizing coal. The amount allowed includes \$7,853,000 for contract research and \$367,000 for administration and contract supervision.

#### OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$720, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	722, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	722, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+2, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

## FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS

## BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$22, 073, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	20, 092, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	20, 292, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	-1, 781, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	+200, 000

The amount allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1966 appropriation and the 1967 budget estimate is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
Management-----	\$490, 300	-\$5, 300	-----
Marketing and technology-----	5, 354, 500	-25, 900	-----
Research-----	11, 546, 800	-842, 956	+\$200, 000
Research on fish migration over dams-----	1, 427, 100	-18, 700	-----
Fishing vessel mortgage insurance-----	44, 300	-600	-----
Columbia River fishery facilities-----	2, 429, 000	+36, 700	-----
Rounding-----		-200	-----
Transfer in the estimates-----		+75, 956	-----
Total, Management and Investigation of Resources-----	1 21, 292, 000	1 -1, 781, 000	+200, 000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$1,000,000 transferred from "Pribilof Islands Fund".

Although a decrease of \$1,781,000 below the 1966 appropriation is indicated, the scope of operations under this appropriation item will not be reduced to that extent for the 1967 fiscal year, as an additional \$1,024,000 is to be transferred from the Saltonstall-Kennedy funds for application to the administrative costs of the program.

The increase of \$200,000 over the 1967 budget estimate recommended by the Committee is especially for use in research on menhaden fish along the Atlantic Coast. Menhaden are the country's fourth most valuable fishery resource and the present decline of this resource along the Atlantic Coast is of considerable concern. Statistics reveal a sharp downward trend in the catch of Atlantic menhaden since the harvest of about 1.3 billion pounds in 1962. In 1965 menhaden production was down to 470 million pounds, a 64% decrease from the 1962 harvest. \$309,900 was included in the 1967 budget estimate for this activity. With the additional \$200,000 recommended by the Committee for this purpose, it is hoped that productive research can be accomplished that will be instrumental in reversing the downward trend which has been experienced the past few years in the harvesting of menhaden.

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

## (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$500,000, an increase of \$300,000 over the budget estimate, to continue the re-



search program conducted in foreign countries with excess foreign currencies.

The increase consists of \$150,000 for the translation of Russian fisheries literature, and \$150,000 for the translation of Red Chinese fisheries literature. In the budget estimate these items were included in the Excess Foreign Currency Authorization for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. The purpose of transferring these amounts to this appropriation head is discussed more fully later in the report under the Excess Foreign Currency Authorization item.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1, 980, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	495, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	1, 245, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-735, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	+750, 000

The amount recommended includes the following:

Construction of a new bridge and seawalls at the Beaufort, North Carolina, biological laboratory.....	\$160, 000
Columbia River fishery facilities:	
Hatchery facilities.....	45, 000
Management techniques.....	240, 000
Program supervision and engineering.....	50, 000
	<hr/>
	495, 000

In addition, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$750,000 for the second phase of construction on the Willamette Falls Fishway. Based on the testimony developed during the hearings, it is the opinion of the Committee that work on this project should proceed without interruption. To complement the funds appropriated by the Federal Government, 16.3 percent of the Government's contribution is contributed as industry's share of the total cost of the project under the provisions of the existing Federal Power Commission license held by the industrial complex at the falls.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$5, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	3, 300, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	3, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-2, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-300, 000

Funds recommended under this appropriation item are required to carry out the provisions of Public Law 88-498, approved August 30, 1964, which amended and extended the Act of June 12, 1960, authorizing the payment of construction differential subsidies for fishing vessels constructed under certain restrictive conditions. The new Act extends the date for the acceptance of applications to June 30, 1969, extends coverage to the entire commercial fishing industry, authorizes appropriation of \$10,000,000 annually for the program, and increases the subsidy from 33½ percent to 50 percent.

The reduction of \$300,000 recommended by the Committee is based on the premise that the reduced amount will provide sufficient funds in fiscal year 1967 to process all applications in this connection. As of January 31, 1966, the unobligated balance in this fund amounted

to \$6.3 million, and testimony developed during the hearings indicated that the processing of applications necessarily would continue at a rather slow pace.

#### FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriation, 1966	\$4,713,000
Estimate, 1967	3,210,000
Recommended, 1967	4,710,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	-3,000
Estimate, 1967	+1,500,000

Funds provided under this item are to implement the 5-year program authorized under section 4(a) and 4(b) of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964, Public Law 88-309.

The purpose of the program is to stimulate research and development projects by the several States in the development of the Nation's Commercial Fisheries on a matching fund basis with Federal funding of up to 75 percent of the cost; to assist in the reestablishment of a commercial fishery that has failed due to a resource disaster arising from natural or undetermined causes; and to assist in development of new commercial fisheries.

Because of the wide interest in this program and the number of states ready to participate, the Committee has approved an increase of \$1,500,000 over the budget estimate. This will provide funding for distribution of allocations to States in fiscal year 1967 on the same level as prevailed in fiscal year 1966.

The recommended appropriation would provide \$4,100,000 in aid to States under section 4(a) of the Act; \$400,000 under section 4(b) of the Act, and \$210,000 for program administration.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATION EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966	\$689,000
Estimate, 1967	739,000
Recommended, 1967	739,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	+50,000
Estimate, 1967	

#### ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

##### (APPROPRIATION OF RECEIPTS)

Appropriation, 1966	\$2,464,000
Estimate, 1967	2,468,000
Recommended, 1967	2,468,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	+4,000
Estimate, 1967	

These funds are derived from the sale of fur skins and other wildlife products of the Islands and are used to provide for schooling, medical attention, and other services to the natives of the Islands, for operation and maintenance of facilities, and management of the Alaska fur-seal herd.

## EXCESS FOREIGN CURRENCY AUTHORIZATION

The 1967 budget estimate contained a request for authorization of the use of foreign currency in the following countries and the approximate U.S. dollar equivalent amounts:

Poland.....	\$4, 110, 000
Israel.....	150, 000
Burma.....	300, 000
Ceylon.....	250, 000
Yugoslavia.....	100, 000
Total.....	4, 910, 000

The Committee does not recommend the inclusion of this authorization in the Bill. Extended testimony was held on this particular section of the budget estimate, and it was developed in the hearings that the greater portion of the authorization involved activities subject to great controversy. For example, about \$3,500,000 of the authorization would have been for the construction of a stern-ramp trawler in Poland. The Committee received numerous protests from Members of Congress and other individuals who pointed out that construction of the stern-ramp trawler in Poland would be in contravention of many of the shipbuilding programs in this country, some of them financed by the Federal Government, and that approval of the authorization of the construction of this trawler would decidedly be to the detriment of the American maritime industry.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the past several years has been operating a foreign program under the Special Foreign Currency Program, and in the opinion of the Committee, this is the proper way to finance such activities. The Committee is not inclined to favor the initiation of a program that would merely authorize the use of excess foreign currency.

Two of the items included in the requested authorization, one of \$150,000 for the translation of Russian fisheries literature and another of \$150,000 for the translation of Red Chinese fisheries literature have been included in the estimate under the Special Foreign Currency Program. Based on testimony of the value of this literature, the Committee felt that funding of these activities was warranted in the 1967 fiscal year.

## BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$36, 612, 300
Estimate, 1967.....	37, 304, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	37, 164, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+551, 700
Estimate, 1967.....	-140, 000



The amount allowed by the Committee by activity compared with the 1966 appropriation and the 1967 budget estimate is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate 1967
Fish hatcheries.....	\$7,857,000	+\$380,100	-\$52,000
Wildlife refuges.....	10,396,000	-680,665	-59,000
Soil and moisture conservation.....	708,000		-4,000
Management and enforcement.....	3,389,000		-17,000
Fishery research.....	3,335,000	+123,000	-24,000
Wildlife research.....	5,866,000	+420,600	-36,000
Fishery services.....	1,466,000	+90,000	+81,000
Wildlife services.....	2,521,000	+100,000	-20,000
River basin studies.....	1,414,000		-9,000
Pesticides registration.....	212,000	+1,432	
Transfers in the estimates.....		+117,233	
Total, Management and Investigations of Resources.....	37,164,000	+551,700	-140,000

The net decrease of \$140,000 below the budget estimate consists of a decrease of \$230,000 requested in the budget estimate to provide for increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions and an increase of \$90,000 for cooperative fishery units consisting of: \$40,000 for a unit at Auburn University, Alabama; \$40,000 for a unit at Humboldt College, California; and an increase of \$10,000 for funding of the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$18,299,200
Estimate, 1967.....	3,169,000
Recommended, 1967.....	5,130,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-13,169,200
Estimate, 1967.....	+1,961,000

This item finances the construction of fish hatchery and wildlife refuge facilities and fishery and wildlife research facilities. The amount allowed includes the budgeted program consisting of:

\$84,000 for detailed engineering design and site preparation for replacement of the Eastern Fish Nutrition Laboratory's Research facility; \$1,985,000 for development on 26 national wildlife refuges including \$200,000 for advance planning; and \$1,100,000 for construction of a general-purpose laboratory-office building at the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Laurel, Maryland.

The recommended appropriation also includes \$198,000 for initial construction on the Marine Game Fish Laboratory at Port Aransas, Texas; \$157,000 for initial construction on the Marine Game Fish Laboratory at Panama City, Florida; and \$155,000 for construction of the Central States Fisheries Project, the area office to be located in Indiana.

The amount also includes additional operating funds in the amount of \$50,000 for the hatchery at Norfork, Arkansas; \$27,000 for the hatchery at Natchitoches, Louisiana; and \$100,000 for the hatchery at Wytheville, Virginia.

In addition, funds are included for hatchery renovation and expansion as follows: Senecaville, Ohio (\$100,000); Jackson, Wyoming (\$140,000); Orangeburg County, South Carolina (\$100,000); White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia (\$200,000); Warm Springs Indian



Reservation, Oregon (\$100,000); Winthrop, Washington (\$54,000); Allegheny Fish Hatchery, Pennsylvania (\$90,000); Nashua, New Hampshire (\$120,000); Warm Springs, Georgia (\$100,000); Quinault Indian Reservation, Washington (\$170,000); and \$100,000 for the purpose of conducting a feasibility study into the availability of suitable water supplies needed for constructing a Federal fish hatchery in Apache County, Arizona.

## MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$7, 500, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	6, 000, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	6, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	-1, 500, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

The recommended amount, together with the estimated \$5,000,000 to be available from the receipts from Federal hunting stamps, will provide a total in the migratory bird conservation fund of \$11,000,000 for fiscal year 1967 to continue the expanded Wetlands Acquisition Program authorized by Public Law 87-383. Under the provisions of the Wetlands legislation, the appropriation advances to the fund for acquisition of refuges are to be repaid from receipts beginning in 1969. The Committee expects that the Bureau will continue the policy of more widespread acquisition by easement instead of purchase in fee and reduce the cost of the program.

## APPALACHIAN REGION FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION PROJECTS

Appropriation, 1966-----	
Estimate, 1967-----	\$1, 350, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	1, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+1, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-350, 000

Funds provided under this item are to implement the program of assisting the States in recovering from the damages caused by strip-mine operations where the land is exhausted of its mineral resources, and where mining operations have been abandoned, as provided in Section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, Public Law 89-4.

The total reduction of \$350,000 consists of a decrease of \$250,000 below the estimate for payments to States, and \$100,000 for planning.

The Committee's action in proposing this reduction should not be construed as an inclination of the Committee to retard this program. The reduction is based solely on the belief that since in excess of \$1,300,000 of these funds were unobligated as of January 31, 1966, the additional \$1,000,000 recommended for fiscal year 1967 should be ample to fund the program at a level consistent with the development of program operations.

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$1, 492, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	1, 564, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	1, 549, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+57, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-15, 000

The total recommended decrease of \$15,000 consists of \$14,288 included in the budget estimate to provide for automatic within-grade promotions and \$712 for rounding.

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

## MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$33, 149, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	36, 177, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	35, 694, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+2, 545, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-483, 000

The following table summarizes the increases recommended by the Committee and the reductions made in the budget estimate:

Activity	Budget increases recommended	Reduction below budget estimate
Management of park and other areas:		
Increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions.....	+\$245, 100	-\$100
Operation of new park areas.....	+765, 000	-165, 000
Operation of new facilities and increased visitor workload in existing park areas.....	+1, 812, 600	-312, 600
Additional park informational publications.....	+55, 300	-5, 300
Employees' compensation fund payments.....	+33, 000	
Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission.....	+63, 000	
Nonrecurring item due to program savings resulting from organiza- tional realignments.....	-95, 000	
Total.....	+2, 879, 000	-483, 000
Forestry and fire control:		
Increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions.....	+9, 000	
More adequate fire protection service.....	+82, 000	
Total.....	+91, 000	
Park and recreation programs:		
Increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions.....	+20, 100	
Strengthen National Park System Planning and New Area Studies.....	+102, 200	
Strengthen Registry of National Landmarks Program.....	+61, 700	
Nonrecurring item due to completion of Ice Age and Greers Ferry Dam studies.....	-100, 000	
	+84, 000	
Concessions management:		
Increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions.....	+5, 000	
Nonrecurring item due to program savings resulting from organizational realignments.....	-15, 000	
	-10, 000	
Net increase, 1967.....	+3, 044, 000	-483, 000

## MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$24, 763, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	27, 022, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	26, 680, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+1, 917, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-342, 000

The Committee has approved the requested increase of \$757,600 for roads and trails. The Committee has also approved an increase of \$1,166,200, for maintenance and rehabilitation of buildings, utilities, and other facilities, a decrease of \$342,000 below the amount requested for the operation and maintenance of new facilities. With a base of

\$14,892,600 available for expenditure in fiscal year 1966, the Committee is of the opinion that an increase of \$634,300 will provide sufficient funding for this activity in 1967 if the work is performed in the most economical manner possible.

### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$26, 177, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	23, 500, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	22, 894, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	-3, 283, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-606, 000

The recommended reduction of \$606,000 consists of \$525,000 programed for the construction of an amphitheater at Fort Washington, and \$81,000 for the construction of a tennis stadium in Rock Creek Park. The amount provided by activity consists of the following:

Camping and picnicking facilities-----	\$3, 158, 800
Public service and administrative units-----	9, 802, 500
Utilities-----	5, 223, 000
Employee housing-----	983, 200
Miscellaneous-----	3, 226, 500
Acquisition of water rights-----	500, 000
Total, 1967-----	22, 894, 000

### CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$33, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	30, 000, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	30, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	-3, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

This appropriation provides for liquidation of obligations incurred for the construction of parkways and roads and trails by the National Park Service under the contract authority provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$2, 522, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	2, 562, 100
Recommended, 1967-----	2, 562, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+40, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-100

The decrease of \$100 is for rounding of the appropriation and relates to the increase requested for increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions in the Regional offices.

### OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$20, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	28, 595, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	27, 500, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+7, 500, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-1, 095, 000



The amount allowed includes \$26,055,000 for research and development and \$1,445,000 for administration and coordination.

The reduction of \$1,000,000 in research and development is based on the Committee's opinion that program operations will not progress sufficiently in fiscal year 1967 to require the full funding requested in the budget estimate for this purpose. As of January 31, 1966, \$15,664,000 of the available funds for fiscal year 1966 were unobligated. The Committee's recommendation will provide an additional \$26,055,000 in fiscal year 1967 for research and development.

The reduction of \$95,000 in administration and coordination also relates to program operations at a lower rate than was anticipated in the 1967 budget estimate.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$2, 485, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	2, 351, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	2, 351, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	- 134, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

The amount allowed includes \$2,145,000 for operation and maintenance, and \$206,000 for administration.

#### OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$6, 396, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	6, 894, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	6, 894, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+ 498, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	

The Committee recommends an allowance of \$6,894,000 for administration of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-379, approved July 17, 1964). Funds included in this item will provide a total of \$4,463,000 for assistance to States. This provides \$87,500, for each of the 51 Institutes as authorized under the Act.

It also includes \$2,000,000 for matching grants to Institutes as provided by the Act, an increase of \$500,000 over 1966, and \$431,000 for administrative expenses for 1967.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$4, 597, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	4, 704, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	4, 650, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+ 53, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	- 54, 000

The reduction of \$54,000 relates to the increase of \$65,000 requested in the 1967 budget estimate to permit funding of existing positions on a full year basis in fiscal year 1967. It is the opinion of the Committee that this additional cost can be absorbed by delay in filling positions and by filling positions at a lower salary level than for which they were budgeted.



## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$4, 557, 200
Estimate, 1967-----	5, 186, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	4, 984, 100
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+426, 900
Estimate, 1967-----	-201, 900

The total decrease of \$201,900 includes \$27,000 for increased pay costs for fiscal year 1966 positions; \$20,700 for the increase of one position in the Office of Science Advisor; \$52,800 to fill authorized positions on a full year basis; \$15,500 for an additional position and related costs in the Office of Information; \$60,500 for the establishment of the Office of Program Analysis; \$20,400 in the Office of Administrative Management Services for filling authorized positions on a full year basis and other expenses; and \$5,000 in General Services for other expenses.

The Committee has noted with interest and approval during the hearings, the increased emphasis the Department of Interior plans to give to the new concept in budget formulation commonly referred to as planning, programming, and budgeting. The activities of the Department of Interior are vast and complex, and they continue to grow. With never enough public money to cover all our national wants and not always enough to cover our needs, it is urgent that the Executive Branch, as the formulator of our national budget, take full advantage of every feasible means in the budget formulation process to improve the selection of choices that must necessarily be made. The Committee therefore endorses the object of "PPB" concept and will observe with great interest the progress achieved by the Department in this connection. Of course, the President's direction to the agencies to inaugurate this new plan was given only last summer and there has not been opportunity for a full display of how the new plan, when fully operative, might bear upon the form and content of budget justifications and presentations to the Committee. Necessarily at this point, therefore, that question must remain open.

The Committee has, however, made a reduction of \$60,500 in the funding related to this activity on the basis that this portion of the requested increase of \$175,500 can be absorbed.

## TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—FOREST SERVICE

## FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

The Committee recommends under this heading a total of \$225,673,000, an increase of \$6,288,000 over the 1966 appropriation, and an increase of \$485,000 over the budget estimate. The following is a summary of action taken on the programs included under this appropriation.

## FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$164, 453, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	172, 856, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	172, 821, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+ 8, 368, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-35, 000

The amount allowed by the Committee by activity in comparison with the 1966 appropriation and the 1967 budget estimate is indicated in the following table:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
Forest Land Management:			
National forest protection and management:			
Timber resource management:			
Sales administration and management-----	\$31, 635, 000	+ \$826, 000	-----
Reforestation and stand improvement-----	17, 430, 000	+70, 000	-----
Recreation-public use-----	29, 926, 000	+1, 322, 000	+ \$50, 000
Wildlife habitat management-----	3, 897, 000	+25, 000	-----
Range resource management:			
Management-----	5, 404, 000	+42, 000	-----
Revegetation-----	2, 820, 000	+10, 000	-----
Improvements-----	3, 395, 000	+16, 000	-----
Soil and water management-----	6, 261, 000	+539, 000	-----
Mineral claims, leases, and special uses-----	4, 004, 000	+28, 000	-----
Land classification, adjustments, and surveys-----	5, 605, 000	+1, 260, 000	-200, 000
Forest fire protection-----	25, 120, 000	+666, 000	-----
Structural improvements for fire and general purposes (construction and maintenance)-----	10, 824, 000	-41, 000	-85, 000
Payments to Employees' Compensation Fund-----	733, 000	+64, 000	-----
Subtotal-----	147, 054, 000	4, 827, 000	-235, 000
Amount advanced from "Cooperative Range Improvements"-----	-700, 000		-----
Subtotal, National Forest protection and management-----	146, 354, 000	+4, 827, 000	-235, 000
Water resource development related activities-----	6, 616, 000	+1, 846, 000	+200, 000
Fighting forest fires-----	5, 000, 000		-----
Insect and disease control:			
White pine blister rust control-----	3, 695, 000	+55, 000	-----
Other pest control-----	8, 676, 000	+141, 000	-----
Subtotal, insect and disease control-----	12, 371, 000	+196, 000	-----
Acquisition of lands (Weeks Act)-----	2, 480, 000	+1, 800, 000	-----
Transfer in the estimates-----		-301, 000	-----
Total, Forest Land Management-----	172, 821, 000	+8, 368, 000	-35, 000

Total reductions of \$485,000 below the budget estimate include: \$100,000 for recreation facilities in Eastern United States; \$200,000 for mapping work in the examination and appraisal of land; \$85,000 planning funds for the Missoula Equipment Development Center; and \$100,000 for water development projects built by other agencies.

The amount recommended by the Committee also includes the following increases over the budget estimate: \$200,000 for water recreation facilities on the Middle Fork of Anderson River, Indiana; \$150,000 for improvements on Todd Lake and the Confederate Breastworks in the George Washington National Forest, Virginia; \$50,000 preplanning funds for the construction of a reservoir on the Upper Big River project, Merrimac River Basin, Missouri; and \$50,000 for engineering and recreational planning for the Lusk Creek Project in the Shawnee National Forest, Illinois.

## FOREST RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$37, 374, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	34, 435, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	34, 955, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-2, 419, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	+520, 000

The amount allowed by the Committee for forestry research by activity is as follows:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
Forest Research:			
Forest and range management research:			
Timber management research.....	\$8, 085, 000	+\$58, 000	-----
Watershed management research.....	3, 303, 000	+23, 000	-----
Range management research.....	1, 267, 000	+9, 000	-----
Wildlife habitat research.....	735, 000	+5, 000	-----
Forest recreation research.....	469, 000	-47, 000	-\$50, 000
Subtotal, Forest and range management research.....	13, 859, 000	+48, 000	-50, 000
Forest protection research:			
Forest fire research.....	2, 880, 000	+20, 000	-----
Forest insect research.....	3, 883, 000	+27, 000	-----
Forest disease research.....	2, 096, 000	+15, 000	-----
Subtotal, Forest protection research.....	8, 859, 000	+62, 000	-----
Forest products and engineering research:			
Forest products utilization research.....	6, 355, 000	+278, 000	-150, 000
Forest engineering research.....	571, 000	+155, 000	-100, 000
Subtotal, Forest products and engineering research.....	6, 926, 000	+433, 000	-250, 000
Forest resource economics research:			
Forest survey.....	2, 055, 000	+116, 000	-----
Forest products marketing research.....	1, 591, 000	+100, 000	-182, 000
Forest economics research.....	663, 000	+5, 000	-----
Subtotal, Forest resource economics research.....	4, 309, 000	+221, 000	-182, 000
Forest research construction.....	1, 002, 000	-3, 181, 000	+1, 002, 000
Transfer in estimate.....		-2, 000	-----
Total, Forest Research.....	34, 955, 000	-2, 419, 000	+520, 000

Total decreases of \$482,000 below the budget estimate include \$150,000 for utilization of Appalachian timber; \$100,000 for harvesting and transporting Appalachian timber; \$182,000 for market research for forest products of Appalachia; and \$50,000 for forest recreation research.

The Committee is in accord with operations of the Forest Service to improve the economy in Appalachia. The reductions recommended in this bill result from evidence developed during the hearings that these programs are still slow in getting under way, and in each instance rather sizeable sums of funds appropriated for these activities in 1965 still remain unobligated. In the opinion of the Committee, the Bill as recommended provides sufficient funds in fiscal year 1967 to keep pace with the agency's ability to develop program operations.

The increases recommended by the Committee over the budget estimate include: \$72,000 planning for an addition to the forest insect and disease laboratory at Delaware, Ohio; and \$450,000 for the construction of a hydrology laboratory at Oxford, Mississippi.



The Committee is informed final plans for the Olympia Laboratory have not yet been completed. It is understood this is a high priority item with the Forest Service and construction funds will be budgeted as soon as the financial situation permits.

Also included are planning funds for the following Forest Research Laboratories: Corvallis, Oregon (\$170,000); La Grande, Oregon (\$28,000); Provo, Utah (\$37,000); Madison, Wisconsin (\$180,000); Nacogdoches, Texas (\$25,000); Berea, Kentucky (\$40,000).

#### STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

Appropriation, 1966	\$17, 558, 000
Estimate, 1967	17, 897, 000
Recommended, 1967	17, 897, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	+ 339, 000
Estimate, 1967	

This program, carried on in cooperation with the States encourages private timber management. The amount allowed includes \$12,-\$11,000 for cooperation in forest fire control; \$300,000 for cooperation in forest tree planting; \$3,538,000 for cooperation in forest management and processing; and \$1,248,000 for general forestry assistance.

#### FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

##### (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Appropriation, 1966	\$102, 136, 000
Estimate, 1967	102, 530, 000
Recommended, 1967	101, 230, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	- 906, 000
Estimate, 1967	- 1, 300, 000

These funds are required to liquidate the obligations incurred under the contract authorization contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

Testimony developed during the hearings indicated that receipts from "Roads and Trails for States" of which 10 percent accrues to this item, would be approximately \$13,000,000 greater than estimated in the budget estimate. It is on this basis that the reduction of \$1.3 million in this appropriation item is recommended.

#### TIMBER DEVELOPMENT, ORGANIZATION LOANS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Appropriation, 1966	
Estimate, 1967	\$500, 000
Recommended, 1967	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	
Estimate, 1967	- 500, 000

Of the \$50,000 for technical assistance and \$950,000 for loans and related expenses appropriated in fiscal year 1965, \$40,820 and \$900,000 remained unobligated as of January 31, 1966. Testimony developed during the hearings indicated that progress in this program will continue at a slow rate. In view of this, it is the opinion of the Committee that funds currently available for this program will be sufficient through fiscal year 1967.



## ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

Appropriation, 1966	-----	-----
Estimate, 1967	-----	\$300, 000
Recommended, 1967	-----	300, 000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1966	-----	+300, 000
Estimate, 1967	-----	-----

Public Law 89-226, approved October 1, 1965, authorizes the acquisition of approximately 10,000 acres of non-Federally owned land within the Uinta National Forest in Utah, to promote the control of floods and the reduction of soil erosion through restoration of adequate vegetative cover. The Act provides \$300,000 for purchase of these lands which are located on the South Fork of the Provo River. This land constitutes the watershed from which the city of Provo draws its municipal water supply.

## ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

Appropriation, 1966	-----	\$1, 000, 000
Estimate, 1967	-----	1, 000, 000
Recommended, 1967	-----	1, 000, 000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1966	-----	-----
Estimate, 1967	-----	-----

These funds are used to provide advice, technical assistance, and financial contribution under Title IV of the Agriculture Act, 1956, to carry out increased tree planting and reforestation work on non-Federal forest land. The funds must be matched by the States and the work is conducted in accordance with plans submitted by the States and approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

## FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Appropriation, 1966	-----	\$72, 500
Estimate, 1967	-----	61, 400
Recommended, 1967	-----	61, 400
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1966	-----	-11, 100
Estimate, 1967	-----	-----

## COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Appropriation, 1966	-----	\$123, 000
Estimate, 1967	-----	115, 000
Recommended, 1967	-----	115, 000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1966	-----	-8, 000
Estimate, 1967	-----	-----

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

## INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1966	-----	\$67, 191, 000
Estimate, 1967	-----	73, 448, 000
Recommended, 1967	-----	73, 250, 000
Comparison:		
Appropriation, 1966	-----	+6, 059, 000
Estimate, 1967	-----	-198, 000

The amount allowed by the Committee by activity in comparison with the 1966 appropriation and the 1967 budget estimate is indicated in the following table:

Activity	Committee bill, 1967	Bill compared with—	
		1966 appropriation	Estimate, 1967
Hospital health services.....	\$42,686,000	+\$3,363,000	—\$198,000
Contract medical care.....	13,942,000	+1,081,000	-----
Field health services.....	14,792,000	+1,698,000	-----
Administration.....	1,830,000	—62,000	-----
Transfers in the estimate.....		—21,000	-----
Total, Indian Health Activities.....	73,250,000	+6,059,000	—198,000

The net reduction of \$198,000 recommended by the Committee consists of a decrease of \$448,000 in the requested increase of \$3,561,000 for hospital health services; and an increase over the budget estimate of \$250,000 for the elimination of trachoma, which is currently on the increase among the various Indian tribes in the country. In addition to the \$250,000 increase recommended by the Committee, the agency is directed to utilize an additional \$250,000 of available funds for this purpose providing a total of \$500,000 for work on the elimination of trachoma among the Indians.

The Committee cannot emphasize too strongly its desire that immediate and effective action be taken to prevent the further spread of trachoma. This is a controllable disease and with proper safeguards can be restricted to a reasonable level. In the 1930's trachoma infected approximately one-fourth of the Indian population. However, with the introduction of sulfonamides in 1938, it became evident that trachoma could often be cured in a matter of weeks. A crash program of treatment for all the Western Tribes, in which sulfanilamide was used, almost eradicated trachoma on the reservations. The program was interrupted during World War II and was not reestablished at the end of the war. As a result, by 1956 trachoma had returned to its pre-1938 level among Indians in areas of the Southwest.

During fiscal year 1967, the Public Health Service is requested to furnish this Committee with quarterly reports, indicating the action that has been taken to curb this disease, and the results obtained.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$14,096,000
Estimate, 1967.....	14,422,000
Recommended, 1967.....	13,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	—1,096,000
Estimate, 1967.....	—1,422,000

The Committee approves the construction program as submitted in the 1967 budget estimate, but has reduced funding available for the program by the amount \$1,422,000. This reduction is made on the basis of anticipated slippage in the construction program during fiscal year 1967. As of January 31, 1966, there was an unobligated balance of \$14,000,000 in the 1966 construction program.

## INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$347, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	438, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	382, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+ 35, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	- 56, 000

The \$35,000 increase recommended by the Committee is to cover the costs of hearing reporter service.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$818, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	1, 144, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	1, 005, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+ 187, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	- 139, 000

The net increase of \$187,000 recommended by the Committee consists of \$82,500 for additional personnel and related costs; \$10,000 for additional office space; \$6,800 for office equipment and supplies; \$2,080 for telephone and communication costs; \$40,000 for the Capitol Hill Study; \$45,000 for publication programs; and \$620 for increased telephone service rates charged by the General Services Administration.

LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY AND  
PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

Appropriation, 1966.....	
Estimate, 1967.....	\$6, 100, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	
Estimate, 1967.....	- 6, 100, 000

The Committee recommends disallowance of the total budget request consisting of \$3,200,000 for the acquisition of park land in Fairfax County, Virginia, and \$2,900,000 was for the acquisition of park land in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

Extensive discussion of the merits of the land acquisition proposed under this appropriation item was held during the hearings, both with the National Park Service and the National Capital Planning Commission. The consensus of the Committee on this particular issue is well covered in the printed hearings. Therefore, the Committee does not believe it is necessary in this report to repeat all the ramifications involved in this appropriation request.

However, the Committee does feel it would be appropriate at this time to cite a few salient facts in this connection for the guidance of the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Park Service in the future:

1. When this request was first presented to the Committee, the Capper-Cramton Act was cited as the authority for the acquisition. However, although \$6.1 million was being requested, the remaining authorization for the acquisition of this land under the Capper-Cramton Act amounted to only \$3,624,636. At the time hearings were held on this appropriation item, it was first suggested to the Committee that the land acquisition in Prince Georges County,



Maryland be financed under the authority of the Capper-Cramton Act, and the land acquisition in Fairfax County, Virginia be financed under the authorization of the Act of June 6, 1924 (43 Stat. 463). The Capper-Cramton Act is specific legislation for acquisition and development of land along the Potomac River, and it is a well established fact that where specific legislation exists, general legislation cannot be utilized to accomplish what cannot be done under the specific legislation. Accordingly, the Committee is of the opinion that sufficient legislative authority does not exist to accomplish what the budget estimates for this item proposed.

2. One of the justifications given for the acquisition of this land was the preservation of the scenic beauty along the banks of the Potomac River. The Committee heard numerous witnesses on this proposal and is of the opinion that a sufficient attempt has not been made to protect the natural beauty of the Potomac River banks through the acquisition of easements. Before efforts are made to purchase this high cost land, the Committee feels every effort should be exhausted to accomplish the same purpose through the effective use of easements.

3. Coupled with the proposal for the acquisition of park land in Prince Georges County, Maryland was the proposal to eventually build a parkway from the Wilson Bridge to Fort Washington. The Committee received assurances from the National Capital Planning Commission and the National Park Service that the proposed parkway would not be another express highway, but it was not convinced that this would not be the eventual outcome. The National Park Service is already responsible for the maintenance of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Virginia, the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway. As it has developed, the Committee can see little difference between the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, the Suitland Parkway, and the express turnpikes that are being built with contributions from gasoline taxes. Likewise with the completion of the Beltway, the George Washington Memorial Parkway has also become a commuters' expressway. The Committee is in favor of the construction of scenic parkways in our National Parks that can be enjoyed by park visitors, but it opposes the construction with National Park Service funds of roads that will be used in the main part for commuting and transportation. The Committee feels that this type of highway should be built under the Federal-aid Highway Act.

4. The extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway has been proposed several times in recent years and each time has been voted down. It is the feeling of this Committee that proponents of this extension of the parkway are depending on authorizing legislation which was enacted many years ago and which did not contemplate circumstances as they exist today. In the opinion of this Committee, any further extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway should be taken up with the appropriate legislative committees in the House and the Senate with a view to obtaining current and adequate authorizing legislation for such extension. Such action would resolve many of the questions and doubts now attendant to this proposed extension, and would serve to clarify the intent of Congress with regard to the extent the National Park Service should participate in the building of roads and highways in this area that eventually will be used mainly by commuters. Until such legislation



is obtained, this Committee will not be inclined to give favorable consideration to the funding of any proposed extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway.

### NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$425, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	1, 575, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	1, 400, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+975, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-175, 000

The total reduction of \$175,000 recommended by the Committee consists of decreases of \$110,000 for personal compensation and benefits; \$50,000 other services; \$5,000 travel and transportation of persons; and \$10,000 printing and reproduction.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$3, 679, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	17, 055, 000
Recommended, 1967.....	9, 055, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+5, 376, 000
Estimate, 1967.....	-8, 000, 000

The 1967 budget request contained an item of \$12,200,000 for the acquisition of tunnel liner. As described in the hearings, considerable lead time is required on the procurement of this material because of the individualized specifications. The Committee readily recognizes the need for preplanning in this connection and has no desire to impede the construction of the rail rapid transit system. However, as was brought out in the course of the hearings, slippage in the planning schedule of only six months would obviate the necessity of acquiring this tunnel liner during fiscal year 1967. Although assurances were given to the Committee during the hearings that this slippage would not occur, the Committee is mindful of various statements made in the course of the hearings on the 1966 supplemental appropriation with regard to the necessity of immediate availability of funds for the acquisition of easements and the award of various design contracts.

At the time of the hearing on the 1967 budget estimate, the conceptual engineering design contract had just been awarded. Likewise, no land easements had been obtained. In the opinion of the Committee, maintenance of the schedule for completion of projects as outlined in the justifications for this estimate is questionable. It is for this reason that the Committee is recommending deletion of the funding in the 1967 estimate for the tunnel liner. The Federal share of this expenditure is \$8,000,000.

In the event the Committee has under-estimated the ability of the administrators of this program to proceed, the Committee would be inclined to give favorable consideration to a supplemental estimate in 1967 for this purpose or to approve a reprogramming of available funds to commence procurement of the tunnel liner in fiscal year 1967.

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$10,700,000
Estimate, 1967-----	13,930,000
Recommended, 1967-----	7,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	-3,700,000
Estimate, 1967-----	-6,930,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,000,000, a reduction of \$6,930,000 below the budget estimate, for the grant-in-aid programs authorized in the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-209, approved September 29, 1965).

Of the total amount, \$4,000,000 is provided the Endowment for the Arts under Section 5(c) of the Act; and \$2,000,000 is provided the Endowment for the Arts under Section 5(h) of the Act for grants to States.

Appropriations made under Public Law 89-209 provided \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities under Section 11(b) of the Act. None of these funds has been obligated to date by the Endowment for the Arts and none of the appropriation to the Endowment for the Humanities for this purpose has been obligated.

A total of \$1,000,000 has been recommended for administrative expenses, a reduction of \$180,000 below the budget request.

Although the budget estimate contained a request for the appropriation of \$5,000,000 to the Endowment for the Humanities under Section 7(c) of the Act, no funds are provided in this Bill for this activity. At the time of the hearings on this appropriation item, the Council on the Humanities had not met. The witness for the request was able to give the Committee no specific information whatsoever as to what the request of \$5,000,000 would be used for. Therefore, the Committee has passed over this item of the request without prejudice with the understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate.

The Committee has recommended funding under this appropriation item with certain reservations. As stated in our original report on this appropriation item, the Committee endorses the objective of this program but feels that sound and practical operating procedures must first be established for this activity before the scope of the program is materially extended. The Committee is satisfied that those responsible for the administration of this program are obtaining the best advice possible in establishing guidelines for the award of the various grants under this program. But at the same time the Committee wants to strongly recommend that in the early phases of this program more emphasis be placed on the award of grants to established foundations, organizations, and institutions rather than to numerous individuals in the field of art.

The Committee would also caution that extreme care must be exercised that those responsible for the administration of this program do not unduly influence through the award of grants, the type or style of art which is to be cultivated in this country.

As the Committee views this program, there are many potential pitfalls that must be avoided if it is to merit the continued support of

the Congress. This applies not only to the selection of projects but also the allocation of funds based on priorities among the selected projects.

# DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE

## OFFICE OF EDUCATION

### ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1,000,000
Estimate, 1967.....	1,000,000
Recommended, 1967.....	1,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	-----
Estimate, 1967.....	-----

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the procurement of school equipment and materials, and for teacher training to strengthen education in the arts and humanities.

### PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$750,000
Estimate, 1967.....	907,000
Recommended, 1967.....	907,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+157,000
Estimate, 1967.....	-----

## SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$18,755,000
Estimate, 1967.....	23,437,000
Recommended, 1967.....	22,523,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966.....	+3,768,000
Estimate, 1967.....	-914,000

The recommended decrease of \$914,000 below the budget estimate includes the following reductions: \$93,000 for exhibits, conservation programs and for increased shipping activity for the U.S. National Museum; \$63,000 for additional specialists in the Museum of History and Technology; \$228,000 for research and systematic marine and environmental biology, anthropology, and earth sciences for the Museum of Natural History; \$3,000 for increased workload of the conservation laboratory of the Freer Gallery of Art; \$28,000 to administer the special foreign currency program and the International exchange of publication; and \$499,000 for administrative support.

In the course of the hearings the Committee received the impression, rightly or wrongly, that perhaps the officials of the Smithsonian Institution are not giving and possibly do not plan to give in the near future, adequate attention to planning for the Bicentennial of the American Revolution which will occur in 1976. In the opinion of the Committee, this will undoubtedly be one of the most memorial anniversaries in the history of our country and the Committee feels that it is not too early to begin adequate preparation and plans for the observance and celebration of this momentous occasion.



Certainly such an observance particularly falls within the purview of the activities of the Smithsonian Institution.

To support this recommendation, it is noted that on March 10, 1966 the President transmitted for the consideration of the Congress a Joint Resolution establishing an American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.

It is the expressed desire and intent of the Committee that officials responsible for the operation of the Smithsonian Institution shall without delay, give this matter their immediate attention with a view to the formulation of an appropriate and extensive program of observance and celebration through the use of special exhibits and other means, of the Bicentennial of the American Revolution. This Committee will expect ensuing budget estimates to contain a specific section in this connection.

#### ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND EXCAVATION

##### (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$1,300,000
Estimate, 1967-----	5,700,000
Recommended, 1967-----	2,316,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+1,016,000
Estimate, 1967-----	-3,384,000

This appropriation item is to provide for the use of the Special Foreign Currency Program to award grants to American universities, museums, or other institutions of higher learning interested in conducting research and excavation in archeology and related disciplines in foreign countries.

The reduction of \$3,384,000 recommended by the Committee includes \$300,000 for archeological restoration; \$2,129,000 for systematic and environmental biology; and \$955,000 for museum sciences.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$1,539,000
Estimate, 1966-----	\$1,589,000
Recommended, 1967-----	\$1,589,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+50,000
Estimate, 1967-----	

The amount recommended is for the fifth year of the capital improvements program at the National Zoological Park. The District of Columbia will continue to finance the operation and maintenance of the Zoo.

The amount recommended provides \$170,000 for planning and \$1,419,000 for the construction of a multi-climate animal exhibition building.

The justifications indicate that \$150,000 of planning funds will be used for detailed plans and designs for a public service and administration building. In the opinion of the Committee there is urgent need for replacement of the present administration facilities at the Zoo, and the increased number of visitors attending the Zoo annually would



justify expansion of restaurant facilities at the Zoo. However, the Committee does not feel that the timing is appropriate to include in this planning the facilities to house a lecture hall to seat 300 people to be used for "educational and inspirational films, television presentations, lectures, orientations, and other public service presentations and ceremonies." While this may be a worthy objective for the future, the Committee strongly feels that such facilities must be assigned a much lower priority than those specifically required for exhibition of animals, furnishing necessary visitor facilities, and providing adequate administrative quarters.

#### RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Appropriation, 1966	\$2, 248, 000
Estimate, 1967	2, 300, 000
Recommended, 1967	2, 300, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	+ 52, 000
Estimate, 1967	

The amount recommended provides \$1,870,000 for restoration of the old Court of Claims building; \$133,000 planning funds for the Arts and Industries building; \$250,000 for various feasibility studies; and \$47,000 for repairs to the Belmont Study Center.

#### NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Appropriation, 1966	\$2, 507, 000
Estimate, 1967	2, 765, 000
Recommended, 1967	2, 694, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	+ 187, 000
Estimate, 1967	- 71, 000

The reduction of \$71,000 below the budget estimate recommended by the Committee consists of \$24,170 for three positions in the Office of Information; \$37,075 to fund the Index of American Design; and \$9,755 for miscellaneous administrative expenses.

#### CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966	\$25, 000
Estimate, 1967	35, 000
Recommended, 1967	25, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	
Estimate, 1967	- 10, 000

#### LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1966	\$25, 000
Estimate, 1967	25, 000
Recommended, 1967	25, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966	
Estimate, 1967	

The amount recommended is for operating expenses of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission authorized by Public Law 88-630, approved October 6, 1964. This legislation provided for the establishment of a 27 member commission for a five year period to advise on and coordinate activities of agencies and individuals interested in preserving and marking as much as possible of the route followed by Lewis and Clark in 1804-06.

#### FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR ALASKA

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$174, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	190, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	190, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+ 16, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-----

#### FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$20, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	80, 000
Recommended, 1967-----	80, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1966-----	+ 60, 000
Estimate, 1967-----	-----

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$80,000 for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission as authorized under Public Law 89-305 to enable the Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial, or the selection of a new design for such memorial.

#### LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 7, in connection with Bureau of Indian Affairs, construction:

*except such lands as may be required for replacement of the Wild Horse Dam in the State of Nevada:*

On page 23, in connection with Bureau of Sport Fisheries & Wildlife, Construction:

*Provided, That the unobligated balance remaining on June 30, 1966, of the appropriation granted under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, shall remain available until expended.*

On page 38, in connection with construction of Indian health activities:

*: Provided, That such expenditures during the current or any subsequent fiscal year may, at the option of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be made by the Department of the Interior as contracting agent.*

On page 41, in connection with the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities:

*less the amounts respectively appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section 11(b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.*

On page 42, in connection with the Public Land Law Review Commission:

*and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representation expenses,*

## TRUST FUND RECEIPTS

(Not a charge against general budget revenues)

	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Department of the Interior: <sup>1</sup>			
Deposits by individuals for surveying public lands-----	\$30, 000	\$30, 000	-----
Administration and protection of grazing districts-----	550, 000	550, 000	-----
Trust funds, Alaska townsites, Bureau of Land Management-----	5, 000	5, 000	-----
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, school, etc-----	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	-----
Miscellaneous trust funds of Indian tribes-----	103, 801, 000	103, 371, 000	-\$430, 000
Donations, National Park Service-----	750, 000	750, 000	-----
Gifts or bequests of personal property, National Parks-----	38, 000	38, 000	-----
Advances from District of Columbia, National Park Service-----	15, 000, 000	15, 000, 000	-----
Birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, preservation of, National Parks-----	2, 540	2, 540	-----
Advances, authorized services, Geological Survey-----	2, 100, 000	2, 100, 000	-----
Contributed funds, Bureau of Mines-----	1, 600, 000	1, 600, 000	-----
Contributed funds, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries-----	922, 000	925, 000	+3, 000
Inspection and grading of fishing products, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries-----	675, 000	700, 000	+25, 000
Contributed funds, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife-----	72, 000	74, 000	+2, 000
Cooperation with foreign agencies, Office of Saline Water-----	20, 500	-----	-20, 500
Total, Department of the Interior-----	128, 566, 040	128, 145, 540	-420, 500
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service cooperative work-----	28, 955, 000	29, 955, 000	+1, 000, 000
Other agencies:			
National Capital Planning Commission: Contributed funds-----	102, 000	6, 100, 000	+5, 998, 000
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Donations-----	1, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000
Smithsonian Institution: Canal Zone biological area fund-----	15, 000	15, 000	-----
Contributions, Indian sanitation facilities-----	157, 000	145, 000	-12, 000
Total, other agencies-----	30, 229, 000	38, 215, 000	+7, 986, 000
Grand total-----	158, 795, 040	166, 360, 540	+7, 565, 500

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1966 budget document for 1967. Subject to further revision.



## PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Department of the interior <sup>1</sup>			
Payments to State and Local Governments:			
Leasing of grazing lands-----	\$1, 000	\$1, 000	-----
Payments to States (proceeds of sales)-----	220, 392	266, 000	+ \$45, 608
Payments of royalties to Oklahoma-----	2, 813	10, 000	+ 7, 187
Payments to States (grazing fees)-----	2, 000	2, 000	-----
Payments to States from grazing receipts, public lands-----	618, 000	618, 000	-----
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, payments to Coos Bay and Douglas Counties, Oregon, in lieu of taxes-----			
Oregon and California grant lands, payment to counties-----	900, 000	1, 012, 000	+ 112, 000
Mineral leasing, payment to States-----	20, 037, 859	21, 250, 000	+ 1, 212, 141
Payment to counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Land Management-----	50, 590, 000	53, 545, 000	+ 2, 955, 000
Claim and treaty obligations, Bureau of Indian Affairs-----	131, 000	139, 000	+ 8, 000
Acquisition of lands and loans to Indians in Oklahoma, Act of June 26, 1936-----	160, 500	160, 500	-----
Education expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park-----	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Payments to State of Wyoming, in lieu of taxes on lands in Grand Teton National Park, National Park Service-----	94, 200	96, 000	+ 1, 800
Internal Revenue collections for Virgin Islands, Office of Territories-----	24, 000	24, 500	+ 500
Payment to Alaska from Pribilof Islands receipts-----	10, 405, 984	8, 000, 000	-- 2, 405, 984
Payment to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act-----		200, 000	+ 200, 000
Payment to counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife-----	1, 459, 000	1, 500, 000	+ 41, 000
Subtotal-----	2, 000	2, 000	-----
Subtotal-----	84, 658, 748	86, 836, 000	+ \$2, 177, 252

See footnotes at end of table, p. 45.

## PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Department of the Interior <sup>1</sup> —Continued			
Receipts applied to Operations:			
Expenses, sale of timber, etc., on reclamation land	\$2, 000	\$2, 000	-----
Expenses, Public Land Administration Act	1, 200, 000	1, 200, 000	-----
Operation and maintenance revenue, Indian irrigation systems	3, 890, 000	3, 890, 000	-----
Power revenues, Indian irrigation projects	2, 730, 000	2, 730, 000	-----
Indian arts and crafts fund	200	200	-----
Operation, management, and maintenance and demolition of federally-acquired properties, Independence National Park, National Park Service	3, 900	4, 000	+ \$100
Payments from proceeds of sale of water, Geological Survey	1, 000	1, 000	-----
Migratory Bird Conservation Fund	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	-----
Management of national wildlife refuges and enforcement activities	199, 134	1, 051, 000	+ 851, 866
Expenses incident to sale of refuge products	228, 000	229, 000	+ 1, 000
Subtotal	13, 254, 234	14, 107, 200	+ 852, 966
Mixed Receipts:			
Federal aid in wildlife restoration:			
Payments to States	19, 236, 000	16, 170, 000	- 3, 066, 000
Applied to operations	964, 720	1, 000, 000	+ 35, 280
Federal aid in fish restoration and management:			
Payments to States	6, 810, 000	6, 000, 000	- 810, 000
Applied to operations	563, 380	500, 000	- 63, 380
Subtotal	27, 574, 100	23, 670, 000	- 3, 904, 100
Total, Department of the Interior	125, 487, 082	124, 613, 200	- 873, 882
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service:			
Payments to States and local governments:			
Payments to States, national forests fund (25 percent fund)	35, 504, 000	36, 800, 000	+ 1, 296, 000
Payments to Minnesota (Cook, Lake, and St. Louis Counties)	141, 000	141, 000	-----



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967

Item	Fiscal year 1966		Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the bill for 1967	Bill compared with—	
	Appropriations, 1966	Total (including anticipated pay supplemental, 1966)			Appropriation, 1966 (including anticipated pay act supplemental)	1967 estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT						
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT						
Management of lands and resources----	\$49,080,000	\$49,575,000	\$48,755,000	\$48,755,000	—\$820,000	-----
Construction and maintenance-----	3,150,000	3,150,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	—250,000	-----
Public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract author- ization)-----	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000		-----
<i>Oregon and California grant lands (in- definite appropriation of receipts)-----</i>	<sup>1</sup> (16,945,000)	(16,945,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	(—7,195,000)	-----
<i>Range improvements (indefinite appropri- ation of receipts)-----</i>	(1,346,000)	(1,346,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	(+102,000)	-----
Total, Bureau of Land Manage- ment-----	54,230,000	54,725,000	53,655,000	53,655,000	—1,070,000	-----



BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS						
Education and welfare services-----	105, 846, 000	107, 048, 000	115, 296, 000	114, 475, 000	+7, 427, 000	-\$821, 000
Resources management-----	42, 796, 000	43, 365, 000	44, 611, 000	44, 086, 000	+721, 000	-525, 000
Construction-----	2 35, 151, 000	35, 151, 000	57, 164, 000	55, 325, 000	+20, 174, 000	-1, 839, 000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	17, 445, 000	17, 445, 000	16, 754, 000	16, 754, 000	-691, 000	-----
General administrative expenses-----	4, 520, 000	4, 623, 000	4, 677, 000	4, 623, 000	-----	-54, 000
Menominee educational grants-----	44, 000	44, 000	-----	-----	-44, 000	-----
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds-----	205, 802, 000	207, 676, 000	238, 502, 000	235, 263, 000	+27, 587, 000	-3, 239, 000
<i>Tribal funds</i> (not included in totals of this tabulation)-----	(3, 000, 000)	(3, 000, 000)	(3, 000, 000)	(3, 000, 000)	-----	-----
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION						
Salaries and expenses-----	3, 398, 000	3, 466, 000	3, 910, 000	3, 910, 000	+444, 000	-----
<i>Land and water conservation</i> (indefinite appropriation of receipts)-----	(125, 000, 000)	(125, 000, 000)	(110, 000, 000)	(110, 000, 000)	(-15, 000, 000)	-----
Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation-----	3, 398, 000	3, 466, 000	3, 910, 000	3, 910, 000	+444, 000	-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1966		Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the bill for 1967	Bill compared with—	
	Appropriations, 1966	Total (including anticipated pay supplemental, 1966)			Appropriation, 1966 (including anticipated pay act supplemental)	1967 estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued						
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT—Con.						
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES						
Administration of territories-----	\$14, 579, 000	\$14, 579, 000	\$10, 513, 000	\$10, 513, 000	—\$4, 066, 000	-----
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands-----	17, 344, 000	17, 447, 000	17, 494, 000	17, 494, 000	+ 47, 000	-----
<i>Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation-----</i>	(100, 000)	(100, 000)	-----	-----	(— 100, 000)	-----
Total, Office of Territories-----	31, 923, 000	32, 026, 000	28, 007, 000	28, 007, 000	— 4, 019, 000	-----
THE ALASKA RAILROAD						
Payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund-----	4, 100, 000	4, 100, 000	-----	-----	— 4, 100, 000	-----
Total, Public Land Management-----	299, 453, 000	301, 993, 000	324, 074, 000	320, 835, 000	+ 18, 842, 000	— \$3, 239, 000

MINERAL RESOURCES					
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY					
Surveys, investigations, and research-----	71, 680, 870	73, 190, 870	73, 920, 000	72, 782, 000	-408, 870
BUREAU OF MINES					
Conversion and development of mineral resources-----	31, 891, 000	32, 391, 000	31, 466, 000	31, 540, 000	-851, 000
Health and safety-----	9, 507, 000	9, 599, 000	9, 390, 000	9, 390, 000	-209, 000
Solid waste disposal-----	3 1, 400, 000	1, 400, 000	4, 335, 000	4, 000, 000	+2, 600, 000
Appalachian region mining area restoration-----			10, 566, 000	8, 000, 000	+8, 000, 000
General administrative expenses-----	1, 529, 000	1, 551, 000	1, 556, 000	1, 556, 000	+5, 000
<i>Helium Fund:</i>					
<i>Borrowing authorization</i> -----	(16, 000, 000)	(16, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(26, 000, 000)	(+10, 000, 000)
Total, Bureau of Mines-----	44, 327, 000	44, 941, 000	57, 313, 000	54, 486, 000	+9, 545, 000
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH					
Salaries and expenses-----	7, 220, 000	7, 220, 000	8, 237, 000	8, 220, 000	+1, 000, 000
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS					
Salaries and expenses-----	704, 000	720, 000	722, 000	722, 000	+2, 000
Total, Mineral Resources-----	123, 931, 870	126, 071, 870	140, 192, 000	136, 210, 000	+10, 138, 130
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS					
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE					
Salaries and expenses-----	444, 000	452, 000	( <sup>4</sup> )		-452, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1966		Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the bill for 1967	Bill compared with—	
	Appropriations, 1966	Total (including anticipated pay supplemental, 1966)			Appropriation, 1966 (including anticipated pay act supplemental)	1967 estimate
<b>TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued</b>						
<b>FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS—Con.</b>						
<b>BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES</b>						
Management and investigations of re-sources-----	\$21,838,000	\$22,073,000	\$20,092,000	\$20,292,000	-\$1,781,000	+\$200,000
<i>Management and investigations of re-sources (appropriation of receipts)-----</i>	-----	-----	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	-----
Management and investigations of re-sources (special foreign currency program)-----	300,000	300,000	200,000	500,000	+200,000	+300,000
Construction-----	1,980,000	1,980,000	495,000	1,245,000	-735,000	+750,000
Construction of fishing vessels-----	5,000,000	5,000,000	3,300,000	3,000,000	-2,000,000	-300,000
Federal aid for commercial fisheries re-search and development-----	4,800,000	4,713,000	3,210,000	4,710,000	-3,000	+1,500,000
General administrative expenses-----	674,000	689,000	739,000	739,000	+50,000	-----
<i>Administration of Pribilof Islands (indefinite appropriation of receipts)-----</i>	(2,454,000)	(2,464,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)	(+4,000)	-----



*Limitation on administrative expenses,  
Fisheries loan fund-----*

Total, Bureau of Commercial  
Fisheries-----

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND  
WILDLIFE

Management and investigations of re-  
sources-----

Construction-----

Migratory bird conservation account-----

Appalachian region fish and wildlife  
restoration projects-----

General administrative expenses-----

Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries  
and Wildlife-----

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Management and protection-----

Maintenance and rehabilitation of  
physical facilities-----

Construction-----

Parkway and road construction (liqui-  
dation of contract authorization)-----

General administrative expenses-----

Total, National Park Service-----

Total, Fish, Wildlife, and Parks--

	(309, 000)	(309, 000)	(309, 000)	(309, 000)			
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries-----	34, 592, 000	34, 755, 000	28, 036, 000	30, 486, 000	-4, 269, 000	+2, 450, 000	
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE							
Management and investigations of re-sources-----	36, 134, 300	36, 612, 300	37, 304, 000	37, 164, 000	+551, 700	-140, 000	
Construction-----	* 18, 299, 200	18, 299, 200	3, 169, 000	5, 130, 000	-13, 169, 200	+1, 961, 000	
Migratory bird conservation account-----	7, 500, 000	7, 500, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	-1, 500, 000	-----	
Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects-----							
			1, 350, 000	1, 000, 000	+1, 000, 000	-350, 000	
General administrative expenses-----	1, 458, 000	1, 492, 000	1, 564, 000	1, 549, 000	+57, 000	-15, 000	
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife-----	63, 391, 500	63, 903, 500	49, 387, 000	50, 843, 000	-13, 060, 500	+1, 456, 000	
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE							
Management and protection-----	32, 366, 000	33, 149, 000	36, 177, 000	35, 694, 000	+2, 545, 000	-483, 000	
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities-----	24, 660, 000	24, 763, 000	27, 022, 000	26, 680, 000	+1, 917, 000	-342, 000	
Construction-----	26, 177, 000	26, 177, 000	23, 500, 000	22, 894, 000	-3, 283, 000	-606, 000	
Parkway and road construction (liqui-dation of contract authorization)-----	33, 000, 000	33, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	-3, 000, 000	-----	
General administrative expenses-----	2, 465, 000	2, 522, 000	2, 562, 100	2, 562, 000	+40, 000	-100	
Total, National Park Service-----	118, 668, 000	119, 611, 000	119, 261, 100	117, 830, 000	-1, 781, 000	-1, 431, 100	
Total, Fish, Wildlife, and Parks--	217, 095, 500	218, 721, 500	196, 684, 100	199, 159, 000	-19, 562, 500	+2, 474, 900	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1966		Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the bill for 1967	Bill compared with—	
	Appropriations, 1966	Total (including anticipated pay supplemental, 1966)			Appropriation, 1966 (including anticipated pay act supplemental)	1967 estimate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued						
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER						
Salaries and expenses-----	\$20, 000, 000	\$20, 000, 000	\$28, 595, 000	\$27, 500, 000	+\$7, 500, 000	—\$1, 095, 000
Operation and maintenance-----	7 2, 485, 000	2, 485, 000	2, 351, 000	2, 351, 000	—134, 000	-----
Total, Office of Saline Water-----	22, 485, 000	22, 485, 000	30, 946, 000	29, 851, 000	+7, 366, 000	—1, 095, 000
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH						
Salaries and expenses-----	8 6, 390, 000	6, 396, 000	6, 894, 000	6, 894, 000	+498, 000	-----
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR						
Salaries and expenses-----	4, 487, 000	4, 597, 000	4, 704, 000	4, 650, 000	+53, 000	—54, 000
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
Salaries and expenses-----	4, 452, 200	4, 557, 200	5, 186, 000	4, 984, 100	+426, 900	—201, 900

Total, direct appropriations-----	678, 294, 570	684, 821, 570	708, 680, 100	702, 583, 100	+17, 761, 530	-6, 097, 000
Total, appropriations of receipts-----	145, 745, 000	145, 755, 000	124, 666, 000	124, 666, 000	-21, 089, 000	-----
Total, borrowing authorization-----	16, 000, 000	16, 000, 000	26, 000, 000	26, 000, 000	+10, 000, 000	-----
Total, title I, Department of the Interior-----	840, 039, 570	846, 576, 570	859, 346, 100	853, 249, 100	+6, 672, 530	-6, 097, 000
<b>TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES</b>						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE</b>						
<b>FOREST SERVICE</b>						
Forest protection and utilization:						
Forest land management-----	162, 318, 000	164, 453, 000	172, 856, 000	172, 821, 000	+8, 368, 000	-35, 000
Forest research-----	36, 764, 000	37, 374, 000	34, 435, 000	34, 955, 000	-2, 419, 000	+520, 000
State and private forestry cooperation-----	17, 513, 000	17, 558, 000	17, 897, 000	17, 897, 000	+339, 000	-----
Total, forest protection and utilization-----	216, 595, 000	219, 385, 000	225, 188, 000	225, 673, 000	+6, 288, 000	+485, 000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	9 101, 172, 000	102, 136, 000	102, 530, 000	101, 230, 000	-906, 000	-1, 300, 000
Timber development organization loans and technical assistance-----			500, 000			-500, 000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:						
Uinta National Forest-----			300, 000	300, 000	+300, 000	-----
Special acts (appropriation of receipts)-----	(80, 000)	(80, 000)	(80, 000)	(80, 000)		-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1966		Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the bill for 1967	Bill compared with—	
	Appropriations, 1966	Total (including anticipated pay supplemental, 1966)			Appropriation, 1966 (including anticipated pay act supplemental).	1967 estimate
TITLE II--RELATED AGENCIES-- Continued						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—Con.						
FOREST SERVICE—con.						
<i>Cooperative range improvements (appropriation of receipts)</i> -----	(\$700, 000)	(\$700, 000)	(\$700, 000)	(\$700, 000)		
Assistance to States for tree planting----	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000		
Total, definite appropriations-----	318, 767, 000	322, 521, 000	329, 518, 000	328, 203, 000	+\$5, 682, 000	-\$1, 315, 000
Total, appropriation of receipts----	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000	780, 000		
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture-----	319, 547, 000	323, 301, 000	330, 298, 000	328, 983, 000	+5, 682, 000	-1, 315, 000
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW						
Salaries and expenses-----	71, 500	72, 500	61, 400	61, 400	-11, 100	



COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses-----	123, 000	123, 000	115, 000	-8, 000	-----
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE					
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE					
Indian health facilities-----	66, 193, 000	67, 191, 000	73, 448, 000	+6, 059, 000	-198, 000
Construction of Indian health activities--	<sup>10</sup> 14, 096, 000	14, 096, 000	14, 422, 000	-1, 096, 000	-1, 422, 000
Total, Public Health Service-----	80, 289, 000	81, 287, 000	87, 870, 000	+4, 963, 000	-1, 620, 000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION					
Arts and humanities educational activities-----	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	-----	-----
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare-----	81, 289, 000	82, 287, 000	88, 870, 000	+4, 963, 000	-1, 620, 000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	347, 000	347, 000	438, 000	+35, 000	-56, 000
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	800, 000	818, 000	1, 144, 000	+187, 000	-139, 000
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system-----	-----	-----	6, 100, 000	-----	-6, 100, 000
Total, National Capital Planning Commission-----	800, 000	818, 000	7, 244, 000	+187, 000	-6, 239, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1966		Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the bill for 1967	Bill compared with—	
	Appropriations, 1966	Total (including anticipated pay supplemental, 1966)			Appropriation, 1966 (including anticipated pay act supplemental)	1967 estimate
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES— Continued						
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY						
Salaries and expenses-----	<sup>11</sup> \$425, 000	\$425, 000	\$1, 575, 000	\$1, 400, 000	+\$975, 000	—\$175, 000
Construction, rail rapid transit system--	<sup>3</sup> <sup>12</sup> 3, 679, 000	<sup>12</sup> 3, 679, 000	17, 055, 000	9, 055, 000	+5, 376, 000	—8, 000, 000
Total, National Capital Trans- portation Agency-----	4, 104, 000	4, 104, 000	18, 630, 000	10, 455, 000	+6, 351, 000	—8, 175, 000
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities:						
Salaries and expenses-----	<sup>3</sup> 5, 700, 000	5, 700, 000	13, 930, 000	7, 000, 000	+1, 300, 000	—6, 930, 000
Endowment for the arts-----	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	-----	-----	—2, 000, 000	-----
Endowment for the humanities----	3, 000, 000	3, 000, 000	-----	-----	—3, 000, 000	-----
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities-----	10, 700, 000	10, 700, 000	13, 930, 000	7, 000, 000	—3, 700, 000	—6, 930, 000

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS	50, 000	50, 000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses-----						-50, 000
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	3 750, 000	750, 000	907, 000	907, 000	+157, 000	-----
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION						
Salaries and expenses-----	18, 468, 000	18, 755, 000	23, 437, 000	22, 523, 000	+3, 768, 000	-914, 000
Archeological research and excavation (special foreign currency program)----	1, 300, 000	1, 300, 000	5, 700, 000	2, 316, 000	+1, 016, 000	-3, 384, 000
Construction and improvements, Na- tional Zoological Park-----	1, 539, 000	1, 539, 000	1, 589, 000	1, 589, 000	+50, 000	-----
Restoration and renovation of buildings	2, 248, 000	2, 248, 000	2, 300, 000	2, 300, 000	+52, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art-----	2, 465, 000	2, 507, 000	2, 765, 000	2, 694, 000	+187, 000	-71, 000
Total, Smithsonian Institution----	26, 020, 000	26, 349, 000	35, 791, 000	31, 422, 000	+5, 073, 000	-4, 369, 000
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	100, 000	100, 000	-----	-----	-100, 000	-----
CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	25, 000	25, 000	35, 000	25, 000	-----	-10, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 59.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Fiscal year 1966		Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the bill for 1967	Bill compared with—	
	Appropriations, 1966	Total (including anticipated pay supplemental, 1966)			Appropriation, 1966 (including anticipated pay act supplemental)	1967 estimate
<b>TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES— Continued</b>						
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION						
Construction, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial-----	\$1, 400, 000	\$1, 400, 000			—\$1, 400, 000	-----
Total, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial-----	1, 425, 000	1, 425, 000	\$35, 000	\$25, 000	—1, 400, 000	—\$10, 000
LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	25, 000	25, 000	25, 000	25, 000	-----	-----
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA						
Grants-----	4, 500, 000	4, 500, 000	-----	-----	—4, 500, 000	-----
FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR ALASKA						
Salaries and expenses-----	174, 000	174, 000	190, 000	190, 000	+ 16, 000	-----







Union Calendar No. 614

89TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 14215

[Report No. 1405]

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 31, 1966

Mr. DENTON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

## A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4       in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5       ment of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year  
6       ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, namely:

## 1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## 2 PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

## 3 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## 4 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

5 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improve-  
6 ment, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classifica-  
7 tion, and performance of other functions, as authorized by  
8 law, in the management of lands and their resources under  
9 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management,  
10 \$48,755,000.

## 11 CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

12 For acquisition, construction and maintenance of build-  
13 ings, appurtenant facilities, and other improvements, and  
14 maintenance of access roads, \$2,900,000, to remain available  
15 until expended.

## 16 PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

## 17 (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

18 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
19 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
20 203, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## 21 OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

22 For expenses necessary for management, protection,  
23 and development of resources and for construction, operation,



1 and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other  
2 improvements on the revested Oregon and California Rail-  
3 road grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and  
4 California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent  
5 rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of ex-  
6 isting connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an  
7 amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all  
8 receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested  
9 Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain  
10 available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount ap-  
11 propriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on  
12 lands administered by the Forest Service shall be trans-  
13 ferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:  
14 *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein for  
15 road construction on lands other than those administered by  
16 the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of  
17 Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*,  
18 That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reim-  
19 bursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant  
20 fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the  
21 Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second  
22 paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August  
23 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

## 1 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

2 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range  
3 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and  
4 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C.  
5 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received,  
6 during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees  
7 under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys  
8 received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of  
9 said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements  
10 from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to  
11 the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787,  
12 dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

## 13 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

14 Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management  
15 shall be available for purchase of one passenger motor  
16 vehicle for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft  
17 for replacement only; purchase, erection, and dismantlement  
18 of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance  
19 of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to  
20 which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations  
21 herein made for the Bureau of Land Management  
22 expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and  
23 California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road  
24 grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appro-

1 priation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be re-  
2 imbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection  
3 (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat.  
4 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and Cali-  
5 fornia land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved  
6 May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated  
7 the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further,*  
8 That appropriations herein made may be expended on a re-  
9 imbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those  
10 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management  
11 and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral re-  
12 sources for the State of Alaska.

## 13 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

### 14 EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

15 For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare  
16 services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with  
17 States and other organizations, including payment (in ad-  
18 vance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance,  
19 and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institu-  
20 tions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy  
21 Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of  
22 rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of  
23 law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian



1 arts and crafts shops; \$114,475,000: *Provided*, That not  
2 to exceed \$85,000 of this appropriation shall be made  
3 available to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe for main-  
4 tenance of law and order.

#### 5 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

6 For expenses necessary for management, development,  
7 improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant  
8 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian  
9 Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and  
10 charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian  
11 industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts  
12 and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian  
13 arts and crafts, as authorized by law; \$44,086,000.

#### 14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction, major repair, and improvement of ir-  
16 rigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other  
17 facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; prepa-  
18 ration of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering  
19 services by contract; \$55,325,000, to remain available until  
20 expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appro-  
21 priated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the  
22 States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South  
23 Dakota, and Utah outside of the boundaries of existing  
24 Indian reservations except lands authorized by law to be



1 acquired for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project: *Pro-*  
2 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
3 used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the  
4 States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or  
5 outside the boundaries of existing reservations except such  
6 lands as may be required for replacement of the Wild Horse  
7 Dam in the State of Nevada: *Provided further*, That such  
8 amounts as may be available for the construction of the Nav-  
9 ajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bu-  
10 reau of Reclamation.

11 ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
12 AUTHORIZATION)

13 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
14 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
15 203, \$16,754,000, to remain available until expended.

16 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary for the general administration  
18 of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in  
19 field offices, \$4,623,000.

20 TRIBAL FUNDS

21 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended  
22 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$3,000,000  
23 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure  
24 for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay

1 and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other  
2 assistance to Indian children attending public and private  
3 schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of  
4 admission) ; purchase of land and improvements on land,  
5 title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States  
6 in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and  
7 water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and  
8 other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved  
9 contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers,  
10 councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organiza-  
11 tions, including mileage for use of privately owned automo-  
12 biles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established  
13 administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian  
14 employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without  
15 regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat.  
16 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator  
17 for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the  
18 approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to  
19 the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the  
20 amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced  
21 to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such pur-  
22 poses as may be designated by the governing body of the  
23 particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary:  
24 *Provided further*, That funds derived from appropriations in

1 satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and  
2 the Court of Claims shall not be available for advances,  
3 except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney  
4 fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program plan-  
5 ning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth  
6 the purposes for which said funds will be used: *Provided,*  
7 *however,* That no part of this appropriation or other tribal  
8 funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights  
9 within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyo-  
10 ming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing  
11 Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the prop-  
12 erty being exempted from local taxation, except as provided  
13 for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627) .

#### 14 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

15 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except  
16 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of  
17 exhibits; purchase of not to exceed ninety-three passenger  
18 motor vehicles (including thirty-five for police-type use  
19 which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price  
20 limitation for the current fiscal year), of which seventy shall  
21 be for replacement only, which may be used for the trans-  
22 portation of Indians; advance payments for service (includ-  
23 ing services which may extend beyond the current fiscal

1 year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June  
2 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70  
3 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision  
4 over certain Indian tribes; and expenses required by con-  
5 tinuing or permanent treaty provisions.

## 6 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

### 7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recrea-  
9 tion, not otherwise provided for, \$3,910,000.

## 10 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
12 the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78  
13 Stat. 897), including \$2,560,000 for administrative expenses  
14 of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal  
15 year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interests therein,  
16 in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the  
17 State or Federal agency concerned, to be derived from the  
18 Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2  
19 of said Act, and to remain available until expended, not to  
20 exceed \$110,000,000 of which (1) not to exceed \$76,-  
21 203,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be  
22 matched by the individual States with an equal amount;  
23 (2) not to exceed \$17,971,500 shall be available to the  
24 National Park Service; (3) not to exceed \$13,093,000



1 shall be available to the Forest Service; and (4) not to  
2 exceed \$172,500 shall be available to the Bureau of Sport  
3 Fisheries and Wildlife: *Provided*, That in the event the  
4 receipts available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund  
5 are insufficient to provide the full amounts specified herein,  
6 the amounts available under clauses (1) through (4) shall  
7 be reduced proportionately.

## 8 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

### 9 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

10 For expenses necessary for the administration of Terri-  
11 tories and for the departmental administration of the Trust  
12 Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the  
13 Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices  
14 of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as author-  
15 ized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1661 (c) ) ; salaries of  
16 the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secre-  
17 tary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of the  
18 immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591,  
19 72 Stat. 1095) ; compensation and mileage of members of  
20 the legislature in American Samoa as authorized by law (48  
21 U.S.C. sec. 1661 (c) ) ; compensation and expenses of the  
22 judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48  
23 U.S.C. 1661 (c) ) ; grants to American Samoa, in addition  
24 to current local revenues, for support of governmental func-

1 tions; loans and grants to Guam, as authorized by law (Pub-  
2 lic Law 88-170); and personal services, household equip-  
3 ment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation  
4 of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American  
5 Samoa; \$10,513,000, to remain available until expended:  
6 *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein  
7 provided for are authorized to make purchases through the  
8 General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That  
9 appropriations available for the administration of Territories  
10 may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance,  
11 and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official  
12 purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found  
13 by the Secretary to be necessary.

14 TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

15 For expenses necessary for the Department of the In-  
16 terior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
17 Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
18 joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the  
19 Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat.  
20 171), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of  
21 the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and  
22 expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pa-  
23 cific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
24 Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of govern-  
25 mental functions; \$17,494,000, to remain available until

1 expended: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the  
2 Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies  
3 or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust  
4 Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting  
5 Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget  
6 and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended,  
7 and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64  
8 Stat. 834) : *Provided further*, That the government of the  
9 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make  
10 purchases through the General Services Administration:  
11 *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the ad-  
12 ministration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may  
13 be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and  
14 operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes  
15 and for commercial transportation purposes found by the  
16 Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of  
17 article 6 (2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
18 Congress.

## 19 ALASKA RAILROAD

### 20 ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

21 The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue  
22 available until expended for the work authorized by law,  
23 including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or  
24 coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with

1 other branches of the Government service, for the purpose  
2 of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight,  
3 passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit  
4 and development of industries or travel in the area  
5 served; and payment of compensation and expenses as  
6 authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916  
7 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided:  
8 *Provided*, That no employee shall be paid an annual salary  
9 out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the  
10 Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS-15,  
11 except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant  
12 general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by  
13 said Act for GS-17, and five officers at not to exceed the  
14 salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS-16.

## 15 MINERAL RESOURCES

### 16 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

#### 17 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

18 For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to per-  
19 form surveys, investigations, and research covering topog-  
20 raphy, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the  
21 United States, its Territories and possessions, and other  
22 areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837 and 76 Stat. 427) ;  
23 classify lands as to mineral character and water and power



1 resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and  
2 Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental  
3 regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases,  
4 permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the inter-  
5 state shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15  
6 U.S.C. 715) ; administer the minerals exploration program  
7 (30 U.S.C. 641) ; and publish and disseminate data rela-  
8 tive to the foregoing activities; \$72,782,000, of which  
9 \$12,350,000 shall be available only for cooperation with  
10 States or municipalities for water resources investigations, and  
11 \$216,000 shall remain available until expended, to provide  
12 financial assistance to participants in minerals exploration  
13 projects, as authorized by law (30 U.S.C. 641-646) , includ-  
14 ing administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30,  
15 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of  
16 1950, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropri-  
17 ation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any  
18 topographic mapping or water resources investigations car-  
19 ried on in cooperation with any State, or municipality.

#### 20 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

21 The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall  
22 be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-six pas-

1 senger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimburse-  
2 ment of the General Services Administration for security  
3 guard service for protection of confidential files; con-  
4 tracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the  
5 making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it  
6 is administratively determined that such procedures are in  
7 the public interest; construction and maintenance of neces-  
8 sary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands  
9 for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S.  
10 National Committee on Geology; and payment of compen-  
11 sation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological  
12 Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the  
13 United States in the negotiation and administration of inter-  
14 state compacts.

## 15 BUREAU OF MINES

### 16 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

#### 17 RESOURCES

18 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,  
19 exploration, development, production, and utilization of min-  
20 eral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Terri-  
21 tories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and sub-  
22 stitutes; \$31,540,000.

## 1 HEALTH AND SAFETY

2 For expenses necessary for promotion of health and  
3 safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling  
4 fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law; \$9,390,000.

## 5 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

6 For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the  
7 Secretary of the Interior under the Solid Waste Disposal  
8 Act, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## 9 APPALACHIAN REGION MINING AREA RESTORATION

10 For expenses necessary in carrying out a nationwide  
11 study of strip and surface mine rehabilitation and reclama-  
12 tion, and a program of mining area restoration, as author-  
13 ized by section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Develop-  
14 ment Act of 1965, \$8,000,000, to remain available until ex-  
15 pended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be  
16 available for the purchase, or for sharing in the cost of  
17 purchase, of lands or interests therein.

## 18 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary for general administration of  
20 the Bureau of Mines; \$1,556,000.

## 21 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

22 Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
23 Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed

seventy-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

## HELIUM FUND

16       The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treas-  
17       ury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant  
18       to section 12 (a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960  
19       to carry out the provisions of the Act and contractual obliga-  
20       tions thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain  
21       available without fiscal year limitation, \$26,000,000, in  
22       addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.



## OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), \$8,220,000 to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$367,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

## OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, \$722,000.

## BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products;

1 collection, compilation, and publication of information con-  
2 cerning such resources; promotion of education and training  
3 of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions  
4 related thereto, as authorized by law; \$20,292,000, and in  
5 addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived from the Pribilof Islands  
6 fund.

7 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

8 (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

9 For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
10 Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
11 quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of  
12 the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as authorized by law,  
13 \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,  
14 That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to  
15 other appropriations to such agency, for payments in the  
16 foregoing currencies.

17 CONSTRUCTION

18 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
19 facilities required for the conservation, management, investi-  
20 gation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery  
21 resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein,  
22 \$1,245,000, to remain available until expended.

## CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 197), \$4,710,000, of which not to exceed \$210,000 shall be available for program administration and \$400,000 shall be available until expended pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Act: *Provided*, That the sum of \$4,100,000 available for apportionment to the States pursuant to section 5 (a) of the Act shall remain available until the close of the fiscal year following the year for which appropriated.

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$739,000.

## ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a-631q), there are appropriated amounts not to exceed \$2,468,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES

## LOAN FUND

During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$309,000 of the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative expenses.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries shall be available for purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only (including one for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of one replacement aircraft; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$3 per man per day; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; and maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries



1 to which the United States has title, and which are utilized  
2 pursuant to law in connection with management and in-  
3 vestigations of fishery resources.

#### 4 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

#### 5 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

6 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic  
7 studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection,  
8 and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except  
9 whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of  
10 other authorized functions related to such resources; opera-  
11 tion of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard  
12 National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance  
13 of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains  
14 Wildlife Refuge; \$37,164,000.

#### 15 CONSTRUCTION

16 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
17 facilities required in the conservation, management, inves-  
18 tigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wild-  
19 life resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests  
20 therein, \$5,130,000, to remain available until expended:  
21 *Provided*, That the unobligated balance remaining on  
22 June 30, 1966, of the appropriation granted under this head  
23 in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies

1 Appropriation Act, 1966, shall remain available until  
2 expended.

3           MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

4       For an advance to the migratory bird conservation  
5 account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16  
6 U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), \$6,000,000, to remain available until  
7 expended.

8           APPALACHIAN REGION FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION  
9                               PROJECTS

10       For expenses necessary in carrying out a fish and wildlife  
11 restoration program, as authorized by section 205 of the Ap-  
12 palachian Regional Development Act of 1965, \$1,000,000,  
13 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this ap-  
14 propriation shall not be available for the purchase, or for  
15 sharing in the cost of purchase, of lands or interests therein.

16           GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

17       For expenses necessary for general administration of  
18 the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such  
19 expenses in the regional offices, \$1,549,000.

20           ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

21       Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
22 Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shall be available for purchase  
23 of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-three passenger  
24 motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirteen are for

1 replacement only (including sixty-three for police-type use  
2 which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price  
3 limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of not to  
4 exceed five aircraft, for replacement only; not to exceed  
5 \$50,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for  
6 information or evidence concerning violations of laws admin-  
7 istered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; publi-  
8 cation and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7  
9 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commutation of rations for officers  
10 and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$3 per man per  
11 day; insurance on official motor vehicles, aircraft and boats  
12 operated by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in  
13 foreign countries; repair of damage to public roads within  
14 and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the  
15 Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, options for the pur-  
16 chase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities  
17 incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas  
18 as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the  
19 maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings and other  
20 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Sport Fish-  
21 eries and Wildlife and to which the United States has title,  
22 and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with  
23 management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

## MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); and not to exceed \$88,000 for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission, \$35,694,000.

MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL  
FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, \$26,680,000.

## CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; the repair



1 or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other  
2 facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood,  
3 or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason  
4 of the use of funds for such purposes; and the acquisition of  
5 water rights; \$22,894,000, to remain available until  
6 expended.

7 PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF  
8 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

9 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
10 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
11 203, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Pro-*  
12 *vided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be ex-  
13 pended for planning or construction on the following: Fort  
14 Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, and Great Falls  
15 Park, Virginia, except minor roads and trails; and Dainger-  
16 field Island Marina, Virginia, and extension of the George  
17 Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard  
18 Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County,  
19 Maryland.

20 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

21 For expenses necessary for general administration of the  
22 National Park Service, including such expenses in the re-  
23 gional offices, \$2,562,000.

1                                   ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

2           Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be  
3 available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and  
4 forty-one passenger motor vehicles of which one hundred  
5 and five shall be for replacement only, including not to  
6 exceed seventy-seven for police-type use which may exceed  
7 by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the  
8 current fiscal year.

9                                   OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

10                                  SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11           For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the  
12 Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951-1958),  
13 authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for bene-  
14 ficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended,  
15 \$27,500,000, of which not to exceed \$1,445,000, shall be  
16 available for administration and coordination during the  
17 current fiscal year.

18                                  OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

19           For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants  
20 for the production of water suitable for agricultural, indus-  
21 trial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as  
22 authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended,  
23 (42 U.S.C. 1958a-1958g), \$2,351,000, of which not to  
24 exceed \$206,000 shall be available for administration.

## 1           OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

## 2                           SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3       For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions  
4 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat.  
5 329), \$6,894,000, of which not to exceed \$431,000 shall  
6 be available for administrative expenses.

## 7           OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

## 8                           SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9       For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor,  
10 \$4,650,000, and in addition, not to exceed \$152,000 may  
11 be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from  
12 other accounts available to the Department of the Interior:  
13 *Provided*, That hereafter hearing officers appointed for  
14 Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the  
15 Administrative Procedures Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended.

## 16           OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

## 17                           SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18       For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of  
19 the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not  
20 to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation  
21 expenses, \$4,984,100.

## 22   GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

23       SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be  
24 available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or

1 office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emer-  
2 gency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft,  
3 buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged  
4 or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable  
5 causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available  
6 under this authority until funds specifically made available  
7 to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have  
8 been exhausted.

9       SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure  
10 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-  
11 tion in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the  
12 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression  
13 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or  
14 threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of  
15 the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this  
16 title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the  
17 payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal  
18 year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for  
19 destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in con-  
20 nection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such  
21 reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently  
22 available at the time of receipt thereof.

23       SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be  
24 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and



1 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will con-  
2 tribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall  
3 be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity  
4 in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30,  
5 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for  
6 costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services  
7 rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
8 time such reimbursements are received.

9 SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of  
10 the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appro-  
11 priations Act, 1967, shall be available for services as  
12 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
13 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, in total  
14 amount not to exceed \$200,000; hire, maintenance and  
15 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; pur-  
16 chase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private  
17 residences in the field, when authorized under regulations  
18 approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when  
19 authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in  
20 societies or associations which issue publications to members  
21 only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who  
22 are not members.

23 SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department  
24 of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for

1 uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5  
2 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4-204).

## 3 TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

### 4 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### 5 FOREST SERVICE

##### 6 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

7 For expenses necessary for forest protection and utiliza-  
8 tion, as follows:

9 Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the  
10 Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the  
11 administration, improvement, development, and management  
12 of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and  
13 preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for  
14 liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal  
15 year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and  
16 other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal  
17 lands; \$172,821,000, of which \$5,000,000 for fighting and  
18 preventing forest fires and \$1,910,000 for insect and disease  
19 control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679  
20 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the extent necessary  
21 under the then existing conditions: *Provided*, That not more  
22 than \$2,480,000 of this appropriation may be used for acqui-  
23 sition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended  
24 (16 U.S.C. 513-519) : *Provided further*, That funds appro-

1 priated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to  
2 section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h),  
3 may be advanced to this appropriation.

4 Forest research: For forest research at forest and range  
5 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-  
6 where, as authorized by law; \$34,955,000.

7 State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation  
8 with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in for-  
9 est tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands,  
10 and in forest management and processing, and for advising  
11 timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and  
12 others in the application of forest management principles and  
13 processing of forest products, as authorized by law; \$17,-  
14 897,000.

15 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
16 AUTHORIZATION)

17 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions  
18 of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relat-  
19 ing to the construction and maintenance of forest develop-  
20 ment roads and trails, \$101,230,000, to remain available  
21 until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pur-  
22 suant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code,  
23 section 203: *Provided*, That funds available under the Act

1 of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with  
2 and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further*,  
3 That not less than the amount made available under the  
4 provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended  
5 under the provisions of such Act.

6 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

7 SPECIAL ACTS

8 For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil  
9 erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior  
10 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance  
11 with the provisions of the following Acts, authorizing annual  
12 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not  
13 to exceed the following amounts from such receipts, Cache  
14 National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347),  
15 as amended, \$20,000; Uinta and Wasatch National Forests,  
16 Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended,  
17 \$20,000; Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada, Act of June 25,  
18 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), as amended, \$8,000; Sequoia Na-  
19 tional Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (54 Stat.  
20 402), \$32,000; in all, \$80,000: *Provided*, That no part of  
21 this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land  
22 which is not within the boundaries of the national forests  
23 and/or for the acquisition of any land without the approval  
24 of the local government concerned.



## 1 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

2 For the acquisition of land in the Uinta National Forest,  
3 Utah, in accordance with the Act of October 1, 1965 (79  
4 Stat. 899), \$300,000, to remain available until expended.

## 5 COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

6 For artificial revegetation, construction, and mainte-  
7 nance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradi-  
8 cation of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in  
9 accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16  
10 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized  
11 by said section, \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

## 12 ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

13 For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the  
14 Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16  
15 U.S.C. 568e), \$1,000,000, to remain available until  
16 expended.

## 17 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

18 Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current  
19 fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to  
20 exceed one hundred and sixty-five passenger motor  
21 vehicles of which one hundred and fifteen shall be for  
22 replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and  
23 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed

1 four for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant  
2 to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act  
3 of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 for  
4 employment under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
5 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as  
6 authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended  
7 (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of  
8 buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a);  
9 (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commis-  
10 sion as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911  
11 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests  
12 therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the  
13 Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

14       Except to provide materials required in or incident to  
15 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic  
16 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the  
17 Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine  
18 manufactured from commodities or materials produced out-  
19 side of the United States.

20       Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for

1 acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act  
2 approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519,  
3 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of an  
4 established national forest or purchase unit.

5 FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety  
8 Board of Review, including services as authorized by section  
9 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
10 \$61,400.

11 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing  
14 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including  
15 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and  
16 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Com-  
17 mittee meetings of the Commission either within or outside  
18 the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers ap-  
19 proved by the Commission, \$115,000.

1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE  
2 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE  
3 INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

4 For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to  
5 carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68  
6 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed sixteen  
7 passenger motor vehicles, of which twelve shall be for  
8 replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and  
9 aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service  
10 in private residences in the field, when authorized under reg-  
11 ulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set  
12 forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at  
13 facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324,  
14 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; \$73,250,000.

15 CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

16 For construction, major repair, improvement, and equip-  
17 ment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quar-  
18 ters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and  
19 drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of port-  
20 able buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic  
21 and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized  
22 by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C.  
23 2004a) ; \$13,000,000, to remain available until expended:  
24 *Provided*, That such expenditures during the current or any



1 subsequent fiscal year may, at the option of the Department  
2 of Health, Education, and Welfare, be made by the Depart-  
3 ment of the Interior as contracting agent.

#### 4 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

##### 5 ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

6 For carrying out sections 12 and 13 of the National  
7 Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965,  
8 \$1,000,000.

##### 9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

10 Appropriations contained in this Act, available for  
11 salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as au-  
12 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
13 U.S.C. 55a).

14 Appropriations contained in this Act available for sal-  
15 aries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allow-  
16 ances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954,  
17 as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

18 Appropriations contained in this Act available for  
19 salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of at-  
20 tendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions  
21 or activities for which the appropriation is made or which  
22 will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or manage-  
23 ment of those functions or activities.

## 1 INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

## 2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
4 Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian  
5 Claims Commission, \$382,000, of which not to exceed  
6 \$10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

## 7 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## 8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National  
10 Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), includ-  
11 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of Au-  
12 gust 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances  
13 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131);  
14 \$1,005,000.

## 15 NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

## 16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
18 title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), includ-  
19 ing payment in advance for membership in societies whose  
20 publications or services are available to members only or to  
21 members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of  
22 passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances there-  
23 for, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); \$1,400,000.

## CONSTRUCTION, RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

For expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct, and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, including acquisition of rights of way, land and interests therein, \$9,055,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE  
HUMANITIES

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain available until expended, \$7,000,000, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available for carrying out sections 5 (c) and 5 (h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11 (b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (2) of the Act, but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts, and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively

1 appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section  
2 11 (b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

3 PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Public Land Law Review  
6 Commission, established by Public Law 88-606, approved  
7 September 19, 1964, including services as authorized by  
8 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
9 and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representa-  
10 tion expenses, \$907,000, to remain available until expended.

11 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution,  
14 including research; preservation, exhibition, and increase of  
15 collections from Government and other sources; international  
16 exchanges; anthropological researches; maintenance of the  
17 Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observa-  
18 tions in high altitudes; administration of the National Col-  
19 lection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; in-  
20 cluding not to exceed \$35,000 for services as authorized  
21 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);  
22 purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and  
23 elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as  
24 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees;



1 repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and  
2 preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for  
3 publications; \$22,523,000.

4 ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND EXCAVATION (SPECIAL  
5 FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

6 For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
7 Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
8 quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses for  
9 carrying out museum programs and related research in the  
10 natural sciences and cultural history under the provisions of  
11 section 104 (k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
12 Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704k),  
13 \$2,316,000, to remain available until expended and to be  
14 available only to United States institutions: *Provided*, That  
15 this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other  
16 appropriations to Smithsonian Institution, for payments in  
17 the foregoing currencies.

18 CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL  
19 ZOOLOGICAL PARK

20 For necessary expenses of planning, construction, re-  
21 modeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the  
22 National Zoological Park, \$1,589,000, to remain available  
23 until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount

1 as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of  
2 Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81-84; 75 Stat. 779).

3 RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

4 For necessary expenses of restoration and renovation  
5 of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institu-  
6 tion, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22,  
7 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed \$10,000 for  
8 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
9 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$2,300,000, to remain available  
10 until expended.

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

12 For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery  
13 of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein,  
14 and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized  
15 by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended  
16 by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolu-  
17 tion 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as  
18 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
19 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; payment in advance when authorized by  
20 the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library,  
21 museum, and art associations or societies whose publications  
22 or services are available to members only, or to members  
23 at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair,

1 and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators  
2 and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as  
3 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; purchase, or rental of  
4 devices and services for protecting buildings and contents  
5 thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches,  
6 and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and  
7 repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by  
8 contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms,  
9 or organizations at such rates or prices and under such  
10 terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper;  
11 \$2,694,000.

12 CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
15 the Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366), as amended,  
16 \$25,000.

17 LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses of the Lewis and Clark Trail  
20 Commission, established by Public Law 88-630, approved  
21 October 6, 1964, including services as authorized by section  
22 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$25,000.

1     FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR  
2                                     ALASKA

3         For necessary expenses of the Federal Development  
4     Planning Committees for Alaska, established by Executive  
5     Order 11182 of October 2, 1964, including hire of passenger  
6     motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of  
7     the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$190,000.

8     FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

9         For necessary expenses of the Franklin Delano Roose-  
10    velt Memorial Commission, established by the Act of Au-  
11    gust 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694), \$80,000, to remain available  
12    until expended.

13             GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

14         SEC. 202. The per diem rate paid from appropriations  
15    made available under this title for services as authorized by  
16    section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) or  
17    other law, shall not exceed \$83.

18             TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

19         SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
20    this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the  
21    current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

22         This Act may be cited as the “Department of the In-  
23    terior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967.”





89TH CONGRESS  
2D Session

**H. R. 14215**

[Report No. 1405]

---

---

# **A BILL**

---

---

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

---

---

By Mr. DENTON

---

---

MARCH 31, 1966

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed







# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued April 6, 1966  
For actions of April 5, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 59

### CONTENTS

Adjournment.....12	Farm program.....9	Personnel.....41,46,50
Administrative counsel..22	Food.....47	Poverty.....10,23
Agricultural programs...18	Food for India.....8,15	Prices.....7,26
Animal research....2,45,52	Foreign affairs.....54,57	REA loans.....20,21,28
Appropriations.....1,48,56	Foreign aid.....33	Recreation.....3,29
Buildings.....54	Forest Service....1,44,56	Research.....2,14,45,52
Cattle hides.....16,35	Forestry.....3,44	Retirement.....39
Community development...49	4-H Clubs.....21	River basin.....40
Conservation.....31	Hides.....16	Taxes.....39
Consumer.....34	Housing.....30	Trails.....44
Corn.....5	Inflation.....34	Transportation.....24,57
Easter recess.....12	Intergovernmental	School milk.....19,38,53
Economic report.....51	relations.....25	Small business.....13,55
Electrification....4,21,28	Lands.....11,37	Soil Conservation.....6
Essays.....21	Loans.....13,20	Wages.....26
Expenditures.....43	Manpower.....17	Water research.....14
Farm labor.....36,42	Milk.....19,38,53	Watersheds.....6,27,48
Farm prices.....7,26	Opinion poll.....32	World food.....47

HIGHLIGHTS: see page 7

### HOUSE

1. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967. Completed debate on this bill, H. R. 14215, and postponed a vote on the bill until today, Apr. 6 (pp. 7282-7324). Pending at adjournment was a motion by Rep. Bow to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment to provide that funds appropriated in the bill shall be available for expenditure only to the extent that expenditures shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated in the budget for 1967 (p. 7324).

Rejected the following amendments:

By Rep. Bow, to reduce the total amount of appropriations in the bill by \$7,293,000. pp. 7321-2

By Rep. Bow, to provide that funds appropriated in the bill shall be available for expenditure only to the extent that expenditures shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures estimated in the budget for 1967. pp. 7322-3

By Rep. Jones, Mo., 26 to 86, to provide that appropriations in the bill may not be used for the payment of any part of a salary in excess of \$6,000 a year to any individual who is granted a leave of absence with pay for the purpose of accepting a scholarship, fellowship, or other similar plan to continue his education. p. 7323

2. RESEARCH. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13881, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the transportation, sale, and handling of dogs, cats, and other animals intended to be used for purposes of research or experimentation (H. Rept. 1418). p. 7372
3. RECREATION; FORESTRY. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7524, to provide for the establishment of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore, Ore. p. 7372
4. ELECTRIFICATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7406, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct a third powerplant at the Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Wash. p. 7372
5. CORN. Rep. Nelsen criticized CCC sales of corn, urged an investigation of such sales, and inserted correspondence with this Department and the House Agriculture Committee over the controversy. pp. 7333-7
6. SOIL CONSERVATION. Reps. Thomson, Shriver, and Moore commended the work of the Soil Conservation Service, and Rep. Moore expressed concern over budget cuts for the Service, particularly for the watershed program. pp. 7326-7, 7331-2, 7338-9
7. FARM PRICES. Rep. Michel stated that "last week the Secretary of Agriculture expressed his personal pleasure at recent declines in farm prices and hailed them as a break for the consumer," and stated that the middleman, not the farmer, benefits from "inflated food prices." p. 7278
8. FOOD FOR INDIA. Rep. Purcell commended the food for India proposal, and urged that consideration be given to the use of flour mills in this country in processing flour for shipment to India. pp. 7365-6
9. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Ashbrook inserted a letter to the editor critical of the farm program, particularly the fact the sunflowers, but not soybeans, can be grown on land diverted from corn production. p. 7338
10. POVERTY. Rep. Quie criticized administration of the poverty program by OER, and inserted several items in support of his position. pp. 7339-45
11. LANDS. Received from Interior a proposed bill "to amend section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 7372



The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RALPH TIGNO EDQUID

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4743), for the relief of Ralph Tigno Edquid, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, Ralph Tigno Edquid may be classified as a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of the Act, upon approval of a petition filed in his behalf by Lieutenant and Mrs. Arthur Edquid, a citizen and lawfully resident alien, respectively, of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DAVID GLENN BARKER AND RICHARD PAUL BARKER

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6112), for the relief of David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park), with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, David Glenn Barker (Jai Yul Sung) and Richard Paul Barker (Pil Su Park) may be classified as children within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(F) of that Act, upon approval of a petition filed in their behalf by Sergeant First Class and Mrs. Allen N. Barker, citizens of the United States, pursuant to section 204 of the said Act, subject to all the conditions in that section relating to orphans. Section 204(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, relating to the number of petitions which may be approved, shall be inapplicable in these cases."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### KI SOOK JUN

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9442), for the relief of Ki Sook Jun, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, a petition may be filed by Mr. and Mrs. Charles Hood in behalf of Ki Sook Jun, and the provisions of section 204(c) of that Act relating to the number of petitions which may be approved in behalf of children defined in section 101(b)(1)(F) of the said Act shall not be applicable in this case."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### OSMUNDO CABIGAS

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am one of the "official objectors" on the Private Calendar. The rules of the House do not permit questions, explanations, or debate during the call of the Private Calendar. Nevertheless, I try to study each bill and resolution thoroughly and make my decision objectively and equitably.

Today I objected to the consideration of H.R. 5838, a bill for the relief of Osmundo Cabigas. The bill would authorize payment of \$10,000 to Mr. Cabigas as a gratuity because of the accidental death of his son while on active duty at Andrews Air Force Base.

Last year, after the House Committee on the Judiciary approved this bill, the Congress approved a new group life insurance program for servicemen. It provided retroactive benefits for certain military personnel who were killed between the time national service life insurance expired and the effective date of the new insurance program. Under that law, beneficiaries were granted \$5,000. Congressional policy appeared to be set by this law. Mr. Cabigas is receiving the benefit under this law and, therefore, it does not seem equitable for his case to be treated differently from many others under the general policy established by the Congress.

I commend the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICILES] for his sincere concern for the interests of his constituent. In spite of his earnest and sustained efforts, I was constrained to object for the aforesaid reasons.

#### TO AUTHORIZE THE LOAN OF NAVAL VESSELS TO FRIENDLY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 7813), to authorize the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign coun-

tries, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out all after "lend" down to and including "escort," in line 9 and insert "one destroyer and one destroyer escort from the reserve fleet to the Republic of China on such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from South Carolina, give us a brief explanation of the bill, including the action of the other body?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I gladly yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on August 30, 1965, the House passed three bills authorizing the loan of naval vessels to friendly foreign countries.

These bills were a continuance of a policy adopted by the Congress many years ago to place ships in the hands of our friends so as to permit them to perform functions—particularly anti-submarine warfare—that we would otherwise be required to perform ourselves.

These ships are taken from our reserve or mothball fleet and almost always are the kind of ships that are highly unlikely for return to our active naval fleet. They are serviceable and can do a job but they are not modern ships in the sense of those in our active naval fleet today.

Simply—but not cynically—stated the loan of these ships is for our own benefit and not primarily for the benefit of the friendly foreign nation. We are happy that they can protect their own shores with these ships but, in the last analysis, it is the interests of this country which are being served by these loans.

The Senate took a somewhat different view of the loans contemplated by the three House bills. The Senate agreed with us with respect to ships for Italy, Spain, Turkey, and the Philippines—and substantially agreed with us with respect to Argentina and Brazil.

The Senate, however, did eliminate Venezuela, Peru, Chile, and the Republic of China. The last of these friendly foreign nations, the Republic of China, is the subject of the Senate amendment to H.R. 7813 which is under consideration at this time.

At the conference between the Senate and the House on October 22, 1965, the House accepted the Senate version of the ship loan legislation at least in part because of the lateness in the session. Indeed, October 23, 1965, was the last day of the 1st session of this Congress.

The conference report contains the following language:

It was agreed in conference that the Senate conferees will give serious and sympathetic consideration to the ship loan pro-



gram as passed by the House early in the next session of the Congress.

H.R. 7813, as amended by the Senate, is a reflection of this conference agreement.

The House version of this bill contemplated the loan of one destroyer and two destroyer escorts to the Republic of China. The Senate has amended the ship loan to the Republic of China by striking one of the destroyer escorts.

H.R. 7813 as it is now before the House would do only one thing: permit the loan of one destroyer and one destroyer escort from our mothball fleet to the Republic of China. It does nothing else.

#### FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS

The costs involved in the transfer of these ships are contemplated to be on a cost-share basis with the United States providing grant aid austere reactivation and overhaul and the Republic of China defraying modernization costs. The U.S. share would amount to about \$2.9 million from military assistance funds for a destroyer, and \$2 million for a destroyer escort. The Republic of China share would depend on the extent of modernization the country desires and whether any or all of the work is done in U.S. shipyards. If it is determined to perform all the ship modernization in U.S. yards, costs would be about \$5.7 million for the destroyer and \$2.7 million for the destroyer escort with the Republic of China defraying the differences over the above-mentioned figures.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, the minority side has been well advised on this bill. As usual, the Committee on Armed Services is unanimous in this effort. This is a vital and important part of the military assistance program. The ship that was in question for Venezuela, at the time the original bill passed the House, has been withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the loan of naval vessels to China."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 57]

Abbitt	Brock	Chelf
Abernethy	Burleson	Clark
Adair	Burton, Utah	Colmer
Arends	Cabell	Conyers
Bell	Cahill	Dowdy
Blatnik	Callaway	Farbstein
Boling	Cameron	Farnsley
Bray	Celler	Fino

Foley	Karth
Fraser	Keogh
Fuqua	Kupferman
Gilbert	Leggett
Grider	Long, La.
Griffin	Martin, Ala.
Halpern	Matthews
Hardy	Miller
Harvey, Ind.	Multer
Herring	Murray
Holland	Nix
Huot	Powell
Jacobs	Reinecke
Randall	Resnick
Johnson, Okla.	Ronan

Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
St Germain
Scheuer
Scott
Sweeney
Tenzer
Toll
Tupper
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Whitten
Willis
Wilson, Bob

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

(Mr. McVICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I today have the privilege of introducing a resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary, April 14, of the Union of American Republics, now known as the Organization of American States.

That organization has a noble past, a strong present and a brilliant future. As a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I have had the opportunity to see at close range the activities of that organization during the past year and a half.

The OAS is the institution that maintains the peace and security of the Western Hemisphere. It promotes economic progress and improvements in the welfare and the level of living of all peoples of the region. Most important, it helps to strengthen the principles of individual liberty, free institutions and genuine independence in the hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that we in this body are recognizing the progress of the OAS as it consolidates the gains of the past and creates dynamic and vigorous institutions to meet present and future crises.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14215), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other

purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 14215, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are presenting today for the consideration of the House, the 1967 appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies. The activities included in this bill are extensive in scope, and if I were to fully discuss each and every item in the bill at this time, it would take considerably more than the hour allotted to me. For the Interior Department alone, there is everything from green forests to blue lakes to black coal. Then when the items under the related agencies are included, the variety becomes even more diverse.

I will not endeavor to discuss each item in the bill since I feel that the report on this bill rather fully explains the action recommended by the committee in each instance. Therefore, during the time allotted to me, I will limit my remarks to some of the highlights which I feel should be called to the attention of the House in its consideration of the bill.

Total appropriations recommended in this bill are \$1,321,149,500. This amount consists of \$1,169,703,500 of what we refer to as direct appropriations; \$125,446,000 for the appropriation of receipts; and \$26 million in borrowing authorization. The appropriation of receipts and the borrowing authorization involve a small portion of the total appropriation, and for the 1967 fiscal year, do not vary significantly from what we have provided in these bills during the past several years. Therefore, I will direct my remarks principally to the direct appropriations.

On page 1 of the report you will note that the direct appropriations recommended for 1967 in the amount of \$1,169,703,500, represent an increase of \$30,316,430 over the appropriations approved for the 1966 fiscal year including anticipated pay supplementals. The amount recommended by the committee is also a



decrease of \$34,811,000 below the budget estimate.

Naturally in an appropriation bill of this type, you are bound to have conflicting ideas of the funding which should be provided. The President had his idea, which was reflected in the budget estimate presented to the committee. This committee deemed it appropriate to make some revisions in the amounts included in the budget estimates. I am sure there are others who have even different ideas of how this bill should be funded.

I believe it would be appropriate for me to take a few minutes at this time to commend the members of this subcommittee. All of them are knowledgeable of the activities covered in this bill, each of them has what I would call special knowledge of various aspects of the bill. Attendance at subcommittee hearings by all members was very good, and the chairman was gratified at the interest each of the members displayed in all of the items heard in the hearings.

The subcommittee attempted to delve into each activity covered by this bill to adequately determine the justification of the amounts being requested. We began our hearings on February 2, 1966, and completed the hearings on March 9, 1966.

I am very pleased to state that in all of our discussions on items in this bill, a bipartisan attitude prevailed at all times. I believe I can say without exception that in each of our determinations, the decision was based solely on the merits of the case. With this very excellent cooperation by the members of the subcommittee and the diligence with which they examined each request, I believe I can truthfully say that we are presenting today a well balanced bill, one that should provide sufficient funds to carry out the necessary activities of the agencies, and one that is mindful of various budget considerations that are dictated by world conditions today, and the guidance the Congress has given us through the enactment of various legislation in past years.

I think it is most important that I bring to your attention a consideration that is frequently overlooked and not accorded adequate significance in connection with this bill. To a large extent, this bill is self-supporting through the income derived from the activities it covers. On page 34 of part 1 of the hearings is listed the receipts of the Department of the Interior activities covered under this bill. On page 14 of part 3 of the hearings are listed the receipts generated by the activities of the Forest Service. To summarize these amounts, activities covered by this bill are forecast to generate \$992,300,000 in Federal revenues in fiscal year 1967 as compared to \$758,800,000 in fiscal year 1966. So while appropriations for 1967 will increase by \$30,316,430 in 1967, we will have an increase of \$233,500,000 in receipts generated by the activities of agencies covered by this bill.

Another way one might consider this is that receipts generated by this bill lack only about \$328,849,000 of totally funding the operations in this bill, and it provides approximately \$321,513,000

for various services and facilities for the American Indians.

In my opinion, there are two important considerations that recommend this bill for your approval: First, to a very large extent the activities in this bill are self-supporting; and, second, funding contained in this bill is for the improvement and betterment of America, in fact I feel this appropriation can be properly categorized as "an investment in America."

#### MAJOR INCREASES AND DECREASES

As I have mentioned previously, this bill would provide \$30,316,430 over the funding level of 1966. For the most part, these increases are brought about by new legislation enacted by the Congress and the growing demands on facilities covered by this bill.

To briefly mention a few of the items of increase, I would like to point out that an increase of \$32,500,000 is included in the bill for additional education and welfare services and other assistance to the American Indian. Although appropriations for the Indians have increased materially over the past several years, the general status of the American Indian is still such that we cannot afford to brag about it. School facilities are still limited, although greatly improved over 2 or 3 years ago; and although great progress has been made in improving the general health of the Indians, we still have a severe shortage of medical facilities, and much more work needs to be done in the housing area. I would like to point out that much has been done to improve these areas in other sections of the country during the past years, and it is only fair that we provide the Indians the same benefits.

There is an additional \$4,400,000 for management, protection, and maintenance costs in the national parks. As a result of legislation enacted by the Congress, we have 10 new park areas in 1967, and with our increasing population, national park visitations are increasing each year. It is estimated there will be 127.5 million park visitors in 1967.

Three million six hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for acceleration of the solid waste disposal program, and additional activity in the coal research program.

There is an increase of \$9 million for various activities by the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for restoration projects in the Appalachian region.

Seven million three hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for the acceleration of the saline water research program. A large portion of this increase is for the construction of the replacement plant near San Diego, Calif.

Six million two hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service, mainly in connection with land management practices in connection with the 186 million acres of land in the national forests and grasslands.

Five million three hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for construction of the rail rapid transit system. Legislation authorizing this activity was passed last year and plans for the con-

struction of the system are just now getting underway.

Four million eight hundred thousand dollars of the increase is for additional operating and research costs of the Smithsonian Institution. The new building space authorized by the Congress is now ready for occupancy and of course, it will require additional funds for the staffing and maintenance of these exhibit spaces.

Offsetting these increases we also have some major items of decreases. For example, there is a decrease of about \$21 million in the construction of facilities and roads. This is in consonance with the President's recent indication that to the extent possible, the construction of new projects should be held to a minimum level at the present time.

Ten million dollars of the decrease relates to nonrecurring items which were contained in the 1966 appropriation, consisting of \$1,400,000 for the construction of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial, \$4,500,000 for transitional grants to Alaska, and \$4,100,000 for payments to the Alaska Railroad in connection with damage to its facilities by the earthquake.

Other reductions include \$4 million for the rehabilitation of Guam as a result of the availability of 1966 funds previously appropriated for the urban renewal program which was not approved by the Guam Legislature. There is a \$2 million reduction in subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels, and several other miscellaneous reductions.

#### EXTENT OF ACTIVITIES FUNDED IN THE BILL

On page 3 of the report are listed some of the major activities funded by this bill, and I will mention a few of them at this time: management, conservation, development and protection of the forest, range, mineral and water resources of 464 million acres of the Nation's public domain lands; administration of mining and mineral leasing on 780 million acres in the continental United States and over 250 million acres of submerged lands of the outer Continental Shelf; provision of educational assistance, facilities, and services to 59,800 Indian children in the public schools; management, protection, maintenance, and construction of facilities, including about 18,800 miles of parkways, roads and trails in 230 national parks, and other areas comprising about 26.4 million acres with an estimated 127.5 million visitors in 1967; and the management, protection, and development of 186 million acres of land in the national forests and grasslands, including an estimated harvest of 11.6 billion board feet of timber in 1967 with a value of \$146,400,000.

#### ITEMS OF MAJOR INTEREST IN THE BILL

Several items in this bill were of considerable interest to numerous individuals, and I will take a few minutes at this time to report the recommendation of the committee with regard to these items:

First, Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development: Under Public Law 88-309, funds are provided to finance on a cost-sharing basis, fishery research and development projects proposed by States. The program provides



for financing by the Federal Government of up to 75 percent of the project cost. The objective of this program is to increase the total fishery research effort of the United States. In 1966, a total of \$4,100,000 was available for distribution to the States. The 1967 budget estimate provided for the distribution of \$2,600,000 to the States, a reduction of \$1,500,000. The committee is recommending the restoration of the funding for this program to its 1966 level which will once again provide \$4,100,000 for State projects under this program. This was probably one of the most unpopular reductions recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Numerous outside witnesses appeared before the committee recommending restoration of this reduction, and the committee received hundreds of letters urging restitution of the funds.

Second. Excess foreign currency authorization: For the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the budget estimate recommended an excess foreign currency authorization in the equivalent of about \$4,900,000. This authorization would have provided for the use of foreign currency in Poland, Israel, Burma, Ceylon, and Yugoslavia. The major portion of this authorization, approximately \$3,500,000, was for the construction of a stern-ramp trawler in Poland. There was great opposition to this proposal both by numerous Members of Congress and outside witnesses. The bill as recommended by the committee today contains no authorization for the construction of ships in any foreign country under this bill, and recommends deletion of the total item for excess foreign currency authorization. In the opinion of the committee, funding of operations in foreign countries by this means is not consistent with well-controlled and regulated appropriation procedures.

Third. Land and water conservation fund: Great interest was also indicated in the operation of the land and water conservation fund. This item involves the appropriation of receipts from the sale of recreation/conservation use permits, motorboat fuel tax, and the sale of surplus property. The proceeds of this fund are used for the Federal purchase of land for recreation, forest areas, and wildlife habitat.

In 1966, \$125 million was appropriated for this fund, but due to the decrease in estimated revenue in the fund, \$110 million is provided for 1967.

Included in the funds provided for Federal acquisition was \$10 million for the acquisition of land in the Redwood National Park. The committee has deleted this item without prejudice, in view of the fact that authorizing legislation for the acquisition of this land has not yet been enacted. With a few minor revisions recommended by the committee in the use of this fund, there is a total of \$76,203,000 provided for assistance to States, an increase of \$11,763,000 over the amount provided in the budget estimate, and a similar decrease in the amount available for the Federal land acquisition program.

Amounts available for assistance to States are on a 50-50 matching basis.

Fourth. George Washington Memorial Parkway: Extensive consideration was

given by the committee to the proposal for the acquisition of park land along the Potomac River on both the Virginia and Maryland sides of the river. Of special interest was the acquisition of parkway land from the Wilson Bridge to Fort Washington for the ultimate purpose of constructing a parkway between these points. The committee did not approve this proposal for the reason that adequate authorization does not exist to cover the acquisition of land as proposed in the budget estimate, and in the opinion of the committee, the whole matter of the construction of parkways in this area needs to be reviewed by the proper legislative committees in the House and Senate. Many doubts and questions attend the intent of the authorization on which this request was based, and in the opinion of the committee it would be most beneficial to have a current and specific statement of policy by the Congress with regard to the construction of parkways by the National Park Service, not only in this area but for the entire Nation. Until such legislation is obtained, vexing problems and doubts will continue to attend any proposal for the construction of parkways, especially in the vicinity of the Capital area.

Fifth. Arts and humanities; Public Law 89-209, approved September 29, 1965, authorized grant-in-aid programs for the arts and humanities. The initial appropriation for this activity was made in the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1966. The 1967 budget estimate proposed funding for the National Council on the Arts and the National Council on the Humanities. The committee recommended a reduction of \$1 million below the budget estimate for the National Council on the Arts.

At the time of the hearings, the National Council on the Humanities had just recently been organized and had not met as a body. The budget estimate presented to the committee contained no specific indication whatsoever of a budget program for 1967 since the Council had not approved any specific activities for the budget year as of that time. For this reason, the committee passed over the budget estimate of the National Council on the Humanities without prejudice, pending determination by the Council of specific projects to be financed in fiscal year 1967.

Sixth. Rail rapid transit system: The budget estimate for the National Capital Transportation Agency was reduced by \$8 million. The total budget estimate for this agency was \$25,580,000; \$17,055,000 to be funded under this bill and \$8,525,000 to be funded under the District of Columbia bill.

Included in the estimate was \$12,200,000 for tunnel liner. Although construction is not scheduled to begin until July 1967, it was testified in the hearings that because of the individualistic specifications on this liner, considerable leadtime was necessary for its procurement. In the opinion of the committee, the planning schedule submitted by this agency is quite optimistic, and it is very problematical that preliminary planning and design will have progressed to the point where it will be feasible and practical to begin the procurement of this liner in

fiscal year 1967. For that reason, the committee recommends a reduction of \$8 million in the Federal share of the agency's estimate related to the procurement of the tunnel liner. As stated in the report, the committee has no desire to retard or delay the construction of this system, and if it develops that the planning schedule as set forth in the budget estimate can actually be maintained, the committee will be inclined to give favorable consideration to a supplemental request for this item in 1967 or the reprogramming of available funds for the initiation of procurement of the tunnel liner.

Seventh. Anadromous fish: Public Law 89-304, approved October 30, 1965, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to initiate with the several States a cooperative program for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the Nation's anadromous fish. This legislation authorized to be appropriated for the period ending on June 30, 1970, not to exceed \$25 million to carry out the purposes of the act. There appears to be great interest in this legislation and the committee has received numerous requests regarding the funding of this program in fiscal year 1967.

This matter was discussed during the hearings and the committee was informed that because of the timing of the legislation and the necessary preliminary work that had to be done in getting the States organized since this work was to be performed through cooperative agreements with the States, no funds were included in the 1967 budget estimate for this activity. The committee understands that organizational work on this program is proceeding, and there is a good possibility that funds for the administration of this program will be requested in a supplemental request.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my general remarks on this bill. As I have stated, it has received the serious consideration of the committee; we think it is a bill with good balance, and earnestly recommend its approval.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The reason I am asking this question—and I know it is too late to get some new controversy started here and I am not asking this to start a controversy—but it came to my attention more or less accidentally that within this department there were some high-priced employees who had been given leaves of absence with full pay in order to accept fellowships to work on doctorate degrees—and presumably upon the completion of that they would come back to the department at a still further increase in salary.

What I want to ask is this. Is it the policy of this Government to pay full time when a man is on leave to do something that will benefit his own career?

Mr. DENTON. Congress passed legislation to that effect. This legislation provides that an employee of the government can take training if it improves his work, and if he agrees to stay with the Government employment for a certain length of time. That is applicable not



only in the Department of Interior but in every department of the Government. There are two or three pages in the hearings on this subject.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I want to get this clear. In other words, you are recommending to this Congress that we pay a man who is a grade 12—

Mr. DENTON. We are not making any recommendations. The Congress made the recommendation. Our committee did not enact the legislation. Our committee only appropriates in accordance with the legislative acts that the Congress has enacted. If you are dissatisfied with the program, it is not because of our action but because of the provisions in the Government Employees Training Act, or its maladministration by the agencies.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Let me ask one question. Is there money in this bill to provide the salaries of people who do not do any work and who get additional compensation and sufficient money to maintain them in their schools?

Mr. DENTON. There is money in this bill for the Federal Employees Training Act to carry out the program as directed by the Congress.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I know they were hesitant about giving the names of these people or where they were. This information has to be dragged out of them. I have not made any direct inquiry to the Interior Department to get these names. But the request has been made by a responsible Member of this House and I can tell you that I am reliably informed that there are several employees of this Department who are on leave—with full pay—and their income is being further supplemented by scholarships and fellowships—and at the conclusion of their educational program they will presumably return to work at higher salaries. I have no objection to assisting an individual in getting an education but I do resent my tax dollars being spent to permit any person to draw the equivalent of two salaries when he should be willing to bear a part of the burden himself. The principle, in my opinion, is wrong. The Government Employees Training Act is permissive legislation and was not intended to give such windfalls.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. On page 656 of the hearings, part II, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will find a breakdown of costs. The number of employees total 4,773 who participated in this training program. I might suggest to the gentleman that he might be interested in reading this.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Beginning on page 662, part II, of the hearings, and running for several pages, I find there is a hiring of all kinds of consultants, and just preceding that there is a request for an

additional \$100,000 for the transportation of persons totaling some \$287,000.

Mr. DENTON. I think the gentleman will find our extended remarks on that in the second paragraph of the report. We have looked with disfavor on contracting out so much work, and the hiring of numerous consultants. We think it would be much better for the agencies to use their own employees. We cover that at some length in the report.

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GRIDER. I wish to express my approval and pleasure in relation to this item of \$61,700 to strengthen the registry of national landmark programs. As the chairman has said, this is an All America bill, and I am happy to see that we are not forgetting the value to America of preserving the old landmarks and the old heritage of the days that are now past, and the mementos which are being so rapidly obliterated.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

(Mr. REIFEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], who is chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Interior and Related Agencies, has given all of us in the committee on both sides a full and accurate account of all of the actions of our committee, and I agree with the chairman's statement that this is a nonpartisan bill. Each item has been considered on its merits.

I shall not take up your time unnecessarily in going over again the actions of the committee. Those have been adequately explained to you by our chairman. I am especially pleased with the provisions contained in the bill for the betterment of the Indian Americans in this country.

Actually, the Department of the Interior appropriation request, which exceeds last year's appropriations by some \$30 million, was in the area having to do with Indian programs. Most of it is for school buildings for the education of the Indian children who are in need of classrooms to carry out that important function of our Government.

In that regard the bill attempts to provide comparable facilities that are afforded other segments of our population in regard to their well-being.

As the chairman has pointed out, the bill also contains an additional amount of \$500,000 to attack trachoma. This is a most urgent item. Trachoma is a terrible eye disease, and I think I should take the time to read from the hearings. I refer to part 3, page 949:

Trachoma is a profound personal tragedy for its victims; and it is linked to the economic plight of the people, for the visual impairment and blindness caused by the

disease are an impediment to the acquisition of skills required to improve their economic lot. As a measure of this economic toll, a pilot survey on San Carlos and Sacaton Reservations Indians in fiscal year 1964 found a rate of 830 per 100,000 individuals to be industrially blind (20 per 200 or less vision in both eyes) due to trachoma sequelae. It is of interest in this connection that approximately 23 percent of the blind-aid recipients in Arizona are American Indians and that one-third of these are blind due to trachoma.

As the chairman has pointed out, this disease of the eyes was nearly wiped out back in the 1930's. For some reason or other, particularly in the Southwest among the Apaches and the Navajos, this horrible eye disease is now coming back. This item was added to the budget once the information was available to the committee with respect to the increasing growth of this disease among these peoples.

Trachoma is controllable with sulfanilamide treatments that can be taken orally. When I was a kid on the reservation I remember that they did not have this kind of treatment. The eyelid would be rolled back with a stick, and the eyelid would be scraped. You could hear the victims of this disease screaming a block away. Today the treatment is much more humane. When this appropriation is approved by this House and the other body and becomes law, it will help to start a program to eradicate this dread disease.

The greatest work of the Bureau of Indian Affairs is carried on in the field of education and welfare. We have more students than ever before who are now taking advantage of the educational opportunities provided by this bureau through the appropriations in this bill. This bill contains the funds needed to carry on this challenging work.

As the chairman of our subcommittee has pointed out, I believe it is a tight budget. When the President sent us his budget for fiscal year 1967, he told us that we could continue our domestic spending at about the same rate as in the past and even begin new programs in an orderly and responsible way, at a pace that reflects the claims of our commitments in southeast Asia and Vietnam. So I believe we can have bombs and bread and butter, and maybe a few blossoms strung along the way in these times that are trying men's souls.

The cost of the war has meant some sacrifice. Some of the bureaus and offices of the Department of Interior were asked to cut back on their requests. The members of our committee, and particularly our very able chairman, Mr. DENTON, have made a conscientious and sincere effort to bring the budget requests of the Department of Interior into focus with the realities of fiscal responsibilities.

It is not an easy task to rework budget requests. It is not an easy task to decide which programs should be cut, which should be maintained at their previous levels, and which should be increased or started.

This body has among its Members who have said, time and again, that it should have an opportunity to express its will and not be dictated to by the administra-



tion. We have seen fit to cut \$34 million from the original budget requests. We have seen fit to reallocate at least \$7,200,000 to certain projects that had been considered by the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget and turned down.

As a consequence of hearings, during which individual citizens have come to explain the need of these projects, we have taken into consideration and included in this bill projects which amount to approximately \$7,200,000. I hope this committee will give its full support to this action.

I particularly would like to call the attention of Members of the House to certain areas and programs contained in this bill which merit our special consideration. I endorse the additional funds for the National Park Service. In these times of a little more affluence in our society, our people are going out into the countryside to look for a place to get away, not only from the busy, but also sometimes humdrum, crowded city life. Our population is increasing. There is need for the additional recreation facilities that are made possible in some State or community or area near an overgrown municipality.

I also endorse the expenditure of funds in Samoa and Guam.

I visited Guam shortly after the first hurricane about 2 years ago. In December, I had the pleasure and privilege of visiting the Samoan people, who are now receiving programs that are financed through the interest of this committee, of this body, and the other body.

Progress is being made there in the field of education and health and improved well-being of our friends, the American Samoans. Is is an impressive record.

I am especially interested in the Office of Saline Water, with respect to contributions it can make to the use of brackish water and the possibility of fighting against water pollution in our streams and rivers.

I believe there is a good opportunity for the Job Corps in our park areas, and our Bureau of Land Management, public land areas, and in the reservations under the control and supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. If we have Job Corps camps, they should be out in these open areas, where these people, who may be dropouts from school, may have an opportunity to come in contact with the nature of their country.

I believe these programs can be of mutual benefit if the programs are administered properly and there is sufficient coordination among the agencies. I was a little disturbed to find, as contained in the record of hearings, that the proportion of Job Corps supervisors to of Indian Affairs. If we have Job Corps is probably narrower than it should be.

If we are going to have these camps, I do not know of any better place to have them than in our parks, forests, and land management areas. I agree with the chairman that this bill can be referred to as an investment in America, since practically every item, if analyzed, will be found to be instrumental in making America a little better place in which to

live. I believe this bill merits your approval and merits the approval of the full committee. I recommend it to you for passage without reservation.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

(Mrs. HANSEN of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for his intelligent approach and appraisal of the wide range of problems which face this committee. It is a committee which deals with everything from funding progress in the trust territories to funding the National Capital Transportation Agency here in Washington, D.C.

The hearings were held in great depth and the chairman's fairness toward every section of this Nation and our trust territories, his fairness to all the problems ranging from hurricanes, forest fires and park policing to funding the new arts and humanities program was exceptional.

At this time I would also like to pay tribute to the ranking member of this committee who was chairman of this subcommittee when I first became a member, for his intelligent, alert interest in every American program reported here. It was through his vision and his willingness to make the original investment that the schools of Samoa are today so outstanding. His work on behalf of educational TV has opened a new program of education not only for the young people there, but to the adults. To MIKE KIRWAN I pay a sincere tribute.

No appropriations bill suits everyone in this House. There are those who would cut and those who would raise. Some 64 Members of Congress appeared before us asking for additions and increases in the budget. Many representatives of important segments of the industrial economy appeared before us urging that money be expended in research that can and will mean the future of not only regions, but the Nation. The committee tried to select very carefully those items which should be funded, war or no war, realizing, of course, that the major part of the national budget is going into defense and into winning the conflict in Vietnam.

The largest increase in this entire bill is for our Indian people and even with this increase we are going to have problems. The status of the Indian people in our Nation is a national disgrace. The poverty, the lack of job training, lack of programing for the future all show up today in the housing, inability of many, many Indians to speak our English language and the inability of these Indians to take their place in the 20th century society of these late 1960's. I join the distinguished ranking minority member in his concern.

I commend Secretary Udall of the Department of Interior for his recent statement wherein he proposes a new and more imaginative look at the entire In-

dian problem. This should be done without delay and is almost a century late.

In this appropriations bill there is a substantial increase in funds for Indian schools. I think some of you would be interested in knowing what we have done.

In the year 1959 the percentage of those entering high school from the elementary schools was 46.6 percent. In 1965 it was 77.4 percent. However, it is well to examine this figure a little closer.

In 1965 there were 3,098 students in the ninth grade in the high schools operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In the 10th grade there were 2,766; 11th grade 2,133; 12th grade 1,832. Obviously if these figures relate to potential students, there were substantial dropouts. It is also interesting to note that the number of Indian students graduating from 4-year colleges and universities rose in the year 1960 from 56 to 121.

However, when I questioned the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and asked him, "Have you any comparable percentage between the dropout rate in the Indian boarding schools and in the public schools?" he replied:

With these figures which I have indicated earlier, the high school graduates increased for 46.6 percent to 77.9 percent so that nearly four out of five of those entering Federal boarding high school will remain to graduate.

But, he indicated on page 373 of the hearings that the dropout rate in the public schools during these same years was increasing at a rapid rate and creating a serious situation.

Some of the statistics are listed on page 373 and you will be interested in some of them now: In Arizona of 767 eighth-grade students there were only 273 high school graduates. In my own State of Washington of 189 eighth-grade graduates in the public schools, there were only 95 12th-grade graduates. In the State of New Mexico there were 591 eighth-grade graduates and yet there were only 311 high school graduates.

Therefore, our requests for education today are large in the Federal area, but more needs to be done in the public sector of education. What causes these young people who start the ninth grade in a public high school to drop out before finishing? The dropouts will be related later in their lives to problems of unemployment, crime, juvenile delinquency, and welfare.

The Commissioner testified on page 374 of the hearing record that welfare costs have been going up for several years on the reservations. He related the rising welfare costs to the era of mechanized farming and the slowdown in needs for unskilled seasonal farmworkers.

The only appreciable slowdown in relief and assistance to the unemployed Indians came during the accelerated public works program. The Commissioner stated:

We put \$21 million of direct expenditure for public works on the reservation during a 15-month period. During that period the general assistance load did not increase.

These figures and these statements clearly indicate that unless we educate,



train, and provide some educational opportunity for our Indian people, they will remain on job assistance rolls. It is a far better program for their pride, their families, and for their communities and for the national good that they be trained so that they may become part of the economic future. This is the reason in this bill that you will find sums of money spent to develop industries in their own areas.

Indian reservations need better management and assistance to develop there an economy which will develop the Indians' ability economically.

Turning to another most important facet of our national resources, I would like to point out that in the field of the U.S. Forest Service we did not fund as heavily as we should have. Necessary construction in many instances has not been funded due to the Presidential request and also due to the financial limitations. However, I do want to point up some of the costs of not continuing our research or in slowing down.

For example, we are opening up an Appalachian timber economy and proposing to put it in the mainstream of the entire timber economy of this Nation. Perhaps more than any other industry this one has had its ups and downs. There are periods of tremendous depression and there is behind it one overall pressing problem which is the competitive position of lumber itself with the use of other products—aluminum, steel, glass, plastics. Now, when we are about to want to do a good job in the Appalachia region, I have raised the question, "How can we afford not to go ahead full speed on the research which retain or give the forest products a better position."

This is directly related in the chemistry section of the Madison Forest Products Laboratory.

For forest research the Bureau of the Budget did not propose this year to construct an Animal Damage Laboratory which would serve two States.

The preservation of wild animals and at the same time the preservation of our forests is of major importance. The laboratory facility of the States of Oregon and Washington is pressing hard to develop some way of discouraging animal damage without causing damage to the animal population—this through the use of chemicals on the seeds and on the roots of small trees. In the State of Washington alone the animal damage to our forest development is \$15 million annually. The Government, the States, and private industry spend small fortunes annually in planting trees and in re-seeding operations, not only for forest products, but to maintain watersheds, eliminate the causes of flooding and to restrain drought. For example reforestation in the State of Washington in 1965 cost \$1,734,929.72. Yet, animal damage can destroy in a very short time the investment made by Federal and State Governments as well as the investments by those with private forests. The economy of the entire forest-producing area of the Nation is becoming more and more dependent upon research.

I deeply regret today that there are

not adequate funds to construct these much needed laboratories.

In conclusion, may I say that we funded projects for which we will be criticized undoubtedly, but there is no project in the United States of America that cannot be criticized by someone who wants to criticize. We have appropriated money today for the programing of the arts. The chairman has already explained why the humanities were omitted. And may I indicate to everybody concerned Congress does not wish to supervise the arts. I do urge all of you to read the hearings and the excellent testimony by Mr. Stevens as he appeared before our committee.

The committee has repeatedly made plain our interest and I think there can be no charge by anyone that a program of arts and humanities will be used for propaganda purposes. In fact, to make this plain the committee questioning was long and serious. May I say on behalf of this program, we annually spend millions of dollars for outdoor recreation. The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife receives in this budget some \$37 million. I think it would be well for us to remember that there are millions of people who will never hold a gun in their hands and who will never use a fish pole. They live in the cities of our Nation and access to the outdoors is difficult and often too expensive for many. But these are the people who can benefit from and will enjoy a program of arts. These are the people who will enjoy the ballet, plays, paintings, music and literature. All the Nation will enjoy them, but particularly to our urban dwellers, these potential programs offer a tremendous opportunity to enjoy the creative and performing arts.

This Nation spends substantial sums of money on many and a wide variety of items. I am going to list some of them for you now.

This Nation, in 1964, spent \$13,600 million for liquor. In that same year, they spent \$7,826,000 for tobacco crops.

Let us turn to the field of juvenile delinquency and crime.

FBI figures for 1964: 41 percent of those arrested were under 25 years old. Annual cost of all crime is now estimated by the FBI according to the President's crime message, at \$27 billion. The proportion of crime attributed to youth and juveniles is unknown. Assuming that juvenile delinquents and youth up to age 25 contributed to the total cost of all crime in proportion to their arrests, the figure would be \$11 billion.

Per capita costs is between \$3,000 and \$6,000 per year per bed.

California's budget alone is \$100 million for California Youth Authority. New York Youth Authority is \$55 million—this gives total group under 25 years of age, rather than 16 to 25.

In this year, military assistance for nations around the world, excluding Vietnam, is proposed in total of \$1,150 million which breaks down to \$3,151,000 per day.

Finally, I only want to remind the Members of this Congress to look back

across the centuries of history. What has survived? Art, music, literature, theater. The battles that have been won in many instances are almost forgotten; alliances and lands have changed; but Shakespeare, Brahms, Michaelangelo, DaVinci are immortal.

America will be remembered in the centuries ahead for her ideals, and her surviving culture.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I do not have much time, but I will yield to the gentleman briefly.

Mr. GROSS. The gentlewoman speaks of the illiteracy of the American Indian. I am sure she is right, but how many hundreds of millions of dollars is this Government dishing out each year on the education of foreigners around the world?

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I would just recommend that the gentleman read last year's report of our Committee on Foreign Affairs. He can get the information there. I am discussing American Indians at this time.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

(Mr. McDADE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill pending before us today. However, before I begin to discuss any part of the bill and my impressions of it, first I want to extend my deep appreciation to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] and to our ranking minority member, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] for the kind cooperation and assistance extended to all the members of the committee as we proceeded through these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has already discussed some of the technical problems contained in this bill. My distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] has discussed many of the problems that face the American Indian. Certainly there is no greater advocate of the problems that must be solved on behalf of the American Indian than my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

It is natural inclination for men of concern to occasionally experience moments of introspection, to ask of themselves: What have I done today to better the lot of mankind, to make this great Nation of ours a little better place in which to live? What have I done to so shape the destiny of our Nation that it shall be a richer and greener pasture for our children?

This is a question which those of us who serve in this House cannot ask often enough. For we are privileged to act in a fiduciary capacity for 190 million men, women, and children who share in the ownership of the most noble exercise in Government that mankind has ever known. Inevitably, they share the fruits



of our wisdom when we have the vision to act with purpose.

In just a few short hours at the conclusion of debate, each one of us in this House will have a rare opportunity to end our day's labor, secure in the certain knowledge that we have helped to make the United States of America a richer and greener pasture for tomorrow. We can do so by supporting this appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies. Without equivocation, I say to you that no legislation to come before this body does more to enrich the lives of our fellow Americans.

No legislation will do more to give to our children the same America which was given to us by our own fathers—and certainly this is the smallest heritage we owe the future.

There is in this bill a montage of America under all her magnificent aspects.

There is the continental sweep of the National Park Service. You may stand in the very heartland of America, at Grand Teton. You may look to the far shores of the Pacific, to Point Reyes, and the National Park Service is the protector of beauty there. Or you may look to Cape Cod, where once America's whaling industry plied its trade, and the National Park Service is there. Or you may go deep into the most mysterious swamp in all of our 50 States, the Everglades, where the wildlife is not only prolific but is unspeakably savage and beautiful at the same time, and your guide will probably be one of the men of the National Park Service who are trying to save this remarkable territory for other generations.

Wherever you look the National Park Service is there, and is saving the heritage of America.

And through the Forest Service, they are saving more than mere scenery. They are studying the problem of husbanding our resources in land and water, so that our children may have the land on which to grow their food, and the water that will give life to tomorrow.

If this were the only Agency in this bill, it would give ample justification for its passage. But it is only one of many.

Look to the two sections of the Department of the Interior which are concerned with fishing, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries. We look at the oceans, the vast Pacific on the west and the Atlantic on the east, and the Gulf of Mexico to the south of us. To us they are gigantic bodies of rolling waters, but to the men in the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries they are repositories of the food of the future. There is a new research center in California, and another in Florida. Daily they are researching the patterns of the deeps. So new is this research, that there is a new specie discovered nearly every day.

As a matter of fact, with the new work being done in this field, we have discovered fish swimming in the deeps of the ocean which were thought to be extinct for over a million years. We have scarcely probed the shallow waters of the Grand Banks. We have not even

begun to touch the unknown world of the Marianas Trench and all of the other great deeps that lie on the ocean floor. We know nothing of the chains of mountains and the volcanoes that lie hidden beneath the oceans. We are only now beginning to chart the path of the food fish that move with the winds, the tides, the temperatures, the currents.

And if it is sport you want, not commercial fishing then visit any of the 50 States of America and the Bureau of Sports Fisheries will guarantee that trout and bass will be running in the early morning when you go down to the stream to take up the mantle of Izaak Walton.

But the work of the Department of Interior is certainly not principally concerned with the oceans beyond our borders. It is concerned with the land beneath our feet.

In the Bureau of Geological Survey there are men who are working day and night to discover the still hidden natural resources which the future will demand. They have recently discovered a major silver deposit at Creede, Colo. They are working at new ways to detect petroleum deposits. They are charting the crust of the earth, which their Director, Dr. Pecora, most properly called "a veritable 3-dimensional jigsaw puzzle."

These men who work in the Office of Geological Survey are most remarkable men, who do not think of the edge of the sea as the end of the continent. For them, the land shelf reaching out under the ocean is just as much a part of our Nation as the very land on which we stand today. They are men who have a truly global sweep to their vision, and whose discoveries here are watched by every geologist across the world.

I have spoken often about the ocean. But the Office of Saline Water looks on it with different eyes. In that salt water there may lie not only the food for the future harvests, but even drink for our cities of tomorrow. There are already desalination plants in operation which, at this very moment are converting the waters of the sea into a reservoir of usable, drinkable, water.

You will all remember the magnificent gesture of our commanding officer at Guantanamo Naval Base who, when Castro announced that he was shutting off the water supply for the base, calmly went out and cut the pipe in scorn. Our desalination plant at Guantanamo not only gives our men ample drinking water and bath water; we have enough left over for the swimming pool.

And in the middle of all this natural wonder in this bill is the merest touch of the esthetic in the arts and humanities portion.

Mr. Chairman, I am one who walked in reverence past the painting called the Mona Lisa. I walked past the Pieta at the World's Fair. I have luxuriated in magnificent plays and musicals on Broadway, and in other theaters when these plays were on the road. I read fiction and nonfiction as much as the limited time permitted me allows. I am an unabashed enthusiast for the arts and humanities.

I am reminded of a story of Dr. Johnson who was once invited to dinner, and

who, when asked about the meal later, remarked:

It was a nice dinner, but not the sort of dinner you would invite a man to.

Mr. Chairman, I feel about the arts and humanities section of this bill much as Dr. Johnson felt. Without this section it would still be a fine bill, but not the sort you would invite a man to examine.

There is, finally—and I have deliberately held this portion until last—the Bureau of Mines. Mr. Chairman, this portion of the bill must be very close to my heart, because I represent the northern portion of the anthracite mining section of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I could not possibly finish my remarks without paying my personal compliments and thanks to Dr. Hibbard, the Director, and to Mr. Frank Memmott, the Deputy Director of the Bureau, for the remarkable cooperation they have extended me in my work of representing the 10th Congressional District.

You will note on page 15 of the report on this bill a reference to a "practical means of extinguishing smoldering fires in culm dumps in the State of Pennsylvania." This section refers to the culm dumps in the anthracite area of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to portray the problems we face in this area. It is really only known by those who visit the area. Where others worry about the surface of the earth and what might be done with the land on which they live, my own constituents must worry about the deep mines under the earth and the constant threat of cave-ins, of mine subsidence, with all the attendant destruction to property, and sometimes to life.

In South and North Carolina today men are fighting bravely against forest fires, and I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they may all be extinguished by nightfall, because fire is a dreadful enemy.

But in my own district, Mr. Chairman, we have mine fires that have been burning for 50 years, and we have no hope to extinguish them by nightfall. We have refuse dumps, called culm dumps in the anthracite area, which have caught fire by spontaneous combustion, and which also have been burning for 50 years. They lay a pall of smog over the area on foggy nights, a smog which eats the paint off the houses, that must surely have a serious effect on human lungs, and that hide the highways in a dangerous darkness. We need programs to solve these problems. They are vital to the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this is the bill before us. It is a bill to keep the land green. It is a bill to keep the ground productive. It is a bill to keep the streams of America running with fish. It is a bill to keep the oceans of the world brimming with food fish. It is a bill to keep the air of America unpolluted. And it is a bill to give that final richness to America, the richness of the arts. This is the richness which has made man not just a little better than the animals, but rather just a little less than the angels.



I hope my colleagues will approve this bill in its entirety. I know what work went into the preparation of the final form of this bill. It was not pieced together frivolously. It is the product of prudence and intelligence, and a wise frugality. Let it not be said of us when this day is past that we knew the cost of everything and the value of nothing. This bill was written by men who looked deep within themselves, to learn the value of the future of America. I know of nothing more valuable on the face of this globe.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I want to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman who is now addressing us on his fine presentation and also to commend the distinguished minority member, the gentleman from South Dakota, who made such an excellent presentation here and who has worked so hard in retaining the funds for the arts and humanities. Legislation I sponsored on January 11, 1965, together with many other Members here in the House.

I would like to read several telegrams that I received today, if the gentleman will allow me. The first telegram is from my great and close friend Erich Leinsdorf, conductor of the world renowned Boston Symphony. The telegram is as follows:

BOSTON, MASS.,  
April 4, 1966.

Representative SILVIO O. CONTE,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been greatly disturbed during the past few days by the general trend of the interview of Mr. Roger Stevens by a congressional subcommittee. The arts can only be supported and furthered, and they can progress only when experts are entrusted with all detailed decisions of where support is needed and should be placed. For the United States and its magnitude and considering its other financial commitments, the original sum for the arts and humanities has been small enough. To cut it further will not help us financially but will ruin some of our great reputation in the world of art and science. I hope your vote will be with the arts and sciences.

Respectfully and sincerely,

ERICH LEINSDORF.

And if I may read another one from the American Association of Museums:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
April 4, 1966.

Hon. S. O. CONTE,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

The American Association of Museums, speaking for 5,000 American museums which provide annually educational and cultural programs and services for more than 300 million American children and adults, urges your support of the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities. Museums across the Nation heartily endorse the arts and humanities legislation and realize fully the value to the Nation's cultural life and development of the Foundation's important efforts and programs. These valuable initial efforts of the Foundation should not be curtailed or hampered.

JOSEPH ALLEN PATTERSON,  
Director.

In addition to the two telegrams I have just read to you, I have also received numerous pieces of communication from persons in all walks of life; all supporting this legislation. When this measure was originally under committee study, I received an avalanche of mail in support of the measure. The mail was so overwhelming that I had to keep one person busy full time just responding to the letters I was receiving in support of the art and humanities bill.

The support came from the average Mr. and Mrs. America, and also from some of our noted scholars and educators. The letters came from Dr. Edwin E. Sten, dean of the School of Fine and Applied Arts at Boston College.

From Dr. J. A. Stratton, president of Massachusetts Institute of Technology who in his letter said:

I do want to emphasize my own strong belief in the need for concerted support of the arts and the humanities and to endorse in principle the bills you are now considering which will make this support a reality.

In his letter to the Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Dr. Stratton said:

Despite the magnificent generosity of private gifts in the United States to museums, orchestras, opera companies, universities, and the like in support of the humanities and arts, there is every evidence that this is insufficient. Even great established organizations, such as the Boston Symphony Orchestra, the Metropolitan, and San Francisco Opera Companies, are faced with mounting difficulties every year. Moreover, it has become practically impossible to initiate new ventures solely with private donations.

Other letters of support came from Dr. John W. Lederle, president of the University of Massachusetts; from Russ Miller, director of studies at Deerfield Academy; from Edmond S. Meany, Jr., headmaster of Northfield School. Thus you can see some of the support the arts and humanities bill had.

It is my understanding that later this afternoon an amendment will be proposed to completely delete the Arts and Humanities Foundation from fiscal 1967 funds. I shall not comment on that amendment at that time, but shall limit my remarks to the present ones. I do want each and every member, however, to know that I am completely opposed to such an amendment. The Appropriations Committee has worked long and hard on this year's appropriation measures as we do each year. The Appropriations Committee cut almost \$7 million from the foundations request. To cut more would be to kill this budding giant.

Perhaps if some of my colleagues had more of an opportunity to be exposed to the fine work of groups such as the Boston Symphony they would not be attempting to cut this \$7 million.

I certainly again wish to compliment the gentleman and hope we will at least get these meager sums provided for in this budget.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who preceded me in the well, made one of the finest pleas for the programs financed by the moneys authorized in this legislation that could possibly be made. I wish to congratulate him as a new Member of the Congress for his statement.

I want to take note of the fine relationships that exist between the appropriating committee, especially the Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agency Appropriations, and the authorizing committee of which I am chairman. For many years we have had this fine relationship. This was true when the committee was chairmanned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. It is not true as the committee is chairmanned by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], and those members who serve so ably and unselfishly upon this subcommittee.

I can say to my colleagues that it is a most pleasing experience when one goes before the appropriating committee and is permitted to give his own personal opinion as to the relationship between the authorization procedures and the appropriation procedures. While this bill is not in all detail what I might have asked for if I had been on the committee or perhaps as I would like it now in every detail, nevertheless I do understand as much as anyone the great responsibility of this committee, and I want to congratulate them for the fine work that they have done, and to suggest to my colleagues that we should support this bill wholeheartedly in the form it comes to us.

I think one of the most meaningful statements in the report appears on page 2. The activities covered by the bill are forecast to generate \$992,300,000 in Federal revenues for fiscal year 1967. When we look at the relationship between this amount of money and the amount of money appropriated, we can see how near this Department comes to carrying its own activities.

Then on pages 3, 4, and 5, and part of 6, we have a statement as to the extent of the activities funded in the bill. This is perhaps one of the most concise and factual statements that we have ever had brought before the Congress of the United States as to the activities that come under the jurisdiction of this particular subcommittee.

May I suggest that in this bill there are several places where some warnings are given to the Members of the Congress. It will be well for us to heed these warnings.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW], the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, last Tuesday, when we were in the Committee of the Whole House debating the second supplemental appropriation bill, I



stepped over to the other side of the aisle to address the House, because I was representing the President of the United States in his attempt to keep the \$41 million appropriation for impacted school aid out of the bill, which the President did not want and which was not budgeted.

Perhaps I should now step over there again today in support of the President. I would be very happy to do so, because I believe he needs our support in his effort to hold down Federal spending during the remainder of this year and throughout the fiscal year 1967.

I feel certain that all of you have read several recent press reports that indicated the President has complained that Congress is altering his budget plans to the extent that we are increasing, rather than reducing, his \$112.8 billion expenditure budget for 1967.

Of course we all know that the President and the Bureau of the Budget can control the level of a considerable amount of the Federal spending in 1967, regardless of what Congress does in the way of providing new spending authority. The control of spending has been accomplished by earlier administrations, and it can be done again simply by impounding funds that are available for expenditure on nonessential programs. The classic example of such control is the action taken by a former President, Harry Truman, during the 80th Congress, when he impounded the funds for additional air groups.

Since I was not privy to what the President did in his meeting with the Cabinet last Friday, I am obliged to rely on the report of the White House deputy press secretary, Mr. Robert H. Fleming, with respect to conclusions reached at that meeting. Based upon Mr. Fleming's briefing, I was heartened to learn that the President hopes to reduce the anticipated budget deficit for this year by as much as a billion dollars. The reduction will be accomplished by reducing planned Federal spending during the last 3 months of this year and by the fact that revenues are coming into the Treasury faster than was anticipated in the January budget.

I am elated over the fact that the President has reached the conclusion that one very desirable way to ease inflationary pressures is by cutting back on nonessential Federal spending. This is a cause that I have been espousing constantly since the budget for fiscal year 1967 was submitted to Congress on January 24.

Now, if the President's bureaucratic minions in the departments and agencies will take to heart his admonition to them to seek out and defer outlays that may be desirable but are not essential, then some real progress can be made toward controlling the inflationary pressures in our economy.

I urge Members of the House, on both sides of the aisle, to give the President their unstinting support of his efforts to reduce nonessential Federal spending in this and the 1967 fiscal year as a prime means of controlling inflation.

To do what I can to support the President, I shall, at the appropriate time

today, offer two amendments to the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 14215.

The first of my amendments would reduce total appropriations in the bill by \$7,293,000.

This \$7,293,000 represents the sum of 41 individual increases in appropriations above the budget request. The items covered by this total increase of \$7,293,000 represent projects of vital interest to Members of Congress. I want to make this absolutely clear to each of you. My amendment, if approved, does not affect a single project in this bill. The projects remain in the bill. It simply is a reduction of the total amount in the bill of \$7,293,000, which the bill over-budgets. Congress in its wisdom put these items in the bill, and it would be expected, Congress having put them in the bill, that the Department of the Interior would fund them and take care of them. We are not attacking a single individual item in the bill. It is simply a reduction of that amount.

May I point out to you—and I think this is very important—there is plenty of money in this bill, which amounts to \$1,170 million. There are sufficient funds in here for the Department of the Interior to find \$7,293,000 in order to fund these programs which the Congress in its wisdom put into the bill. So we are not taking out projects but are simply saying to the Department of the Interior that we are staying within the budget requests; you find the money.

It has been said here there is a \$34 million reduction in the budget estimates for this bill. That is right and that is good. But if you take the total amount of cut in the bill, it is about 3 percent. May I point out to you that even though there is a \$34 million reduction in this bill from budget estimates, the bill is still \$30 million higher than was appropriated last year. We can talk about reductions all we like, but I think we also ought to take a look at the amount of the bill and how much it is over the appropriation of last year. Again I point out that with \$1,170 million and an increase of \$30 million over 1966, there is no reason why the Department of the Interior cannot find \$7,293,000 to fund the projects which Congress said are important to all of you. They should be funded, and the President can certainly find ways in which to do it.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. May I remind the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, that the additional \$30 million or more over and above last year results primarily from making funds available for additional school housing for Indian children. This has been in the pipeline in anticipation of the housing for these children come schooltime next year.

Mr. BOW. I say to the gentleman that the \$30 million additional is still there.

Mr. REIFEL. But it is necessary for education.

Mr. BOW. I do not quarrel with you about it at all. The money will stay there. You will still have \$1,170 million. If any agency is in the position of having a budget of \$1,170 million and cannot find \$7 million there for these projects, then you had better get rid of the agency, because we all know that there is plenty of money to take care of these individual items.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. We could find and save \$7 million very easily by knocking out this hearts and flowers expenditure for the so-called arts and humanities, could we not?

Mr. BOW. There is about \$7 million right there.

Now, my other amendment, I will say to my colleagues, limits expenditures provided in this bill to 95 percent of the level proposed by the President for this bill in his budget for 1967. Such limitation would protect the President. I want to protect him from people who want to spend more. It would, in fact, protect him from those who want to spend more than he is proposing. This affects expenditures only and has no effect on proposed appropriations for 1967.

The second amendment would limit the President's spending to 95 percent of what he projected in the 1967 budget for items in this bill. It would prevent him from going further. I might also add that I think it would be a specious argument for anyone to advance the idea that any kind of expenditure limitation amendment would put the affected departments or agencies in a straitjacket with respect to spending. The Committee on Appropriations has already made desirable cuts in the bill where it was determined that they should be made and that action provides flexibility. Again I say to you that this limitation amendment does not affect one dime of appropriations in this bill. It says that the President shall be confined to 95 percent of the amount he projected in the 1967 budget for items in this bill. They cannot force him to go beyond that. These two amendments should be adopted. They do not affect projects in the bill, but they do give the President a little help in trying to cut down on Federal spending.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SKUBITZ. My colleague suggests what we do is take a percentage cut of 5 or 6 percent on every project across the board?

Mr. BOW. No. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. SKUBITZ. What are you suggesting?

Mr. BOW. I am suggesting we take \$7,293,000 of appropriations out of the bill, which is the amount that we have gone over the budgeted separate items, and say to the Department of the Interior, "Here, you have \$1.2 billion. Fund these projects which Congress put in the



bill from the appropriations provided." After all, Congress has the authority to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. We have the authority to say to them, "These are projects which should be funded, and you can find the money to fund them. We are giving you this tremendous amount of money. You take care of these projects. They belong to the Members of Congress."

Mr. SKUBITZ. Has the gentleman from Ohio so decided that he could cut out certain projects?

Mr. BOW. No, I am not saying that we cut out certain projects. I am saying that you could fund the projects out of the money now being appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has spoken, and it is the will of Congress that these projects be given proper care. We say, indeed, take care of them out of this large amount of money we are giving you.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as the 5 or 6 percent across-the-board suggested cut is concerned, this might be a good idea on some of these projects. The President says that if we continue to go beyond his budget figures, he is going to have to ask for increased taxes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a question of whether we want to have an increase in taxes or some real fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this House of Representatives has got to stand up to this question, and if we want to really protect the taxpayers of this country against further increases in the already heavy tax burden, we are going to have to go along with these two amendments which I propose to offer. They do not affect this bill one bit with reference to any specific project contained therein, except they would cut total appropriations by \$7,293,000 and would limit spending for items in this bill to 95 percent of the amount the President proposed for expenditure in 1967 for this bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

(Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to support as strongly as I can the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, with particular reference to the \$7 million recommended by our Appropriations Committee.

As you know, this amount represents a substantial cut in the appropriations recommended by the President for this new agency for the next fiscal year. It represents a cut of \$6,930,000—or almost 50 percent of the funding the President recommended.

Now I recognize that \$5 million of this cut applies to the national endowment for the humanities, because as the House report states, the policymaking National Council on the Humanities, which guides the work of that endowment, had not had an opportunity to meet and formu-

late its plans and programs prior to its chairman's appearance before the Subcommittee on Appropriations chaired by my distinguished colleague from Indiana. My remarks are not addressed now to that portion of the cut. However, for the RECORD I would like to point out that the Humanities Council was sworn into office 2 days after the Council Chairman, Dr. Henry Allen Moe, appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee.

The swearing-in ceremonies took place at the White House at which time the President spoke eloquently on the very meaningful role this Council would play in the advancement of our Nation's learning and scholarship. The Council met in full session after the ceremonies at the White House, and has now framed a detailed program which may now properly be considered by the Senate, and which I feel is most deserving of strong endorsement by the Congress.

We are not debating that issue now, Mr. Chairman, though I repeat I would like the record to show my strong support for the humanities program, and my hope that the Senate will take all appropriate action to remedy an omission of funds which is attributable only to the time elements involved, and is in no way a reflection on the eagerness of the humanities leadership to proceed with their important work with all possible dispatch.

Today, however, we are concerned primarily with the appropriation for the national endowment for the arts, the equal partner with the humanities in the new Foundation, and the partner whose Council has been in being for just over a year.

I had the privilege of serving as floor manager of the bill creating the Council. It represents a group of 26 men and women who have dedicated themselves to the development of the arts in this country, who are nationally and indeed internationally recognized as outstanding leaders in their field of the arts, and who have worked long hours—often without any pay whatsoever—for a cause in which they and countless others deeply believe.

We are not talking about luxuries, or window dressing, or frills or furbelows, for the American scene and our way of life. We are talking about the essential quality of American life, the kind of quality that is absolutely basic to our goals for the future—basic to young people and their development as better human beings, basic to the middle aged and to our older citizens, basic to the whole fabric of our country in terms of both the present and the future.

All leading civilizations throughout history have placed great emphasis on the arts. They have done so because the arts translate into lasting, permanent form man's highest aspirations. These facts are beyond debate. For centuries the arts abroad have been supported at a State or National level. Today the taxpayers in all leading European countries support the arts. Austria, for example, spends \$1.70 per person per year for the arts, including aid to arts festivals which attract thousands of visitors to that country annually.

The per capita expenditure for the arts involved in the appropriation we are considering amounts to less than 4 cents annually. Four cents per person, per year, to benefit the arts by the richest Nation on earth—it is utter nonsense to call that an extravagance. It is sheer folly, and a complete misinterpretation of values, to say that we cannot afford it.

And yet it is just this small amount of money which is so urgently needed.

It is the kind of seed money which can return itself many, many times over, which is fundamental to our recognition of what the arts can do to benefit this country, and which can provide a highly important stimulus to private giving for the arts. That private support is simply no longer adequate to meet the growing demands our people are making on arts organizations all across the Nation. The inadequacy of private support was not only described in detail during the extensive congressional hearings on this legislation, but it is manifest in the hundreds of letters which the arts endowment has been receiving since enactment of the public law. For example, during the period between February 15 and March 31, the endowment received 441 requests for grants; 136 of these were referrals from the Congress; and may I add that more than 30 percent of these—48 in all—were referred by Republican members.

It is ridiculous to suggest that governmental support will diminish private giving for the arts. Just the opposite has been true in those States which have already established programs financed in part by State funds.

And speaking of our States, at a recent conference in Chicago, sponsored by the National Council on the Arts, the Governors of every State sent representatives to that conference held to explain the new law, and how each State could benefit by its provisions which make each State eligible for a maximum of \$50,000 in Federal funds. Some States sent as many as five representatives to the conference—and all at their own expense. That would seem a truly remarkable demonstration of interest for any new Federal program.

There are 55 entities designated to receive Federal funds in the act, including the District of Columbia and the territories. By cutting the total appropriation for the States, and the District and the four other areas, from an authorized and recommended \$2.75 million to the \$2 million before us today, that means that each State can receive only a maximum of \$36,363.63—a cut of more than 30 percent. Whatever is appropriated to the States must be allotted on an equal basis.

To cut State funding for the arts by over 30 percent and the basic grants-in-aid program by 20 percent—from \$5 to \$4 million—would hardly seem in line with an economy drive, not matter how well motivated.

But I am not here to complicate an issue which has already been decided by our Appropriations Committee, or to debate the wisdom of the action they have taken. I am here to defend this pro-



gram and this recommended appropriation against any further incursions.

The program is aimed at helping the individual artist and arts organizations on a nationwide basis, and at assisting each State to develop its own meaningful activities in the arts.

It is directed toward helping the young artist, the young musician, the young writer, painter, and sculptor, as well as the accomplished professional who now ekes out a most meager livelihood and who has been searching for years for the kind of opportunities this program can provide.

It is directed toward satisfying the needs of our people; for there is a great new audience in our country waiting to receive and enjoy excellence in the arts.

It is directed toward education in the arts—education in the classics so essential to our understanding of what is best and meaningful; education for young people in high school and for members of the adult community.

It is directed toward increasing cultural understanding between our Nation and our Latin American neighbors, while at the same time giving our own artists greater opportunities for employment.

It is directed toward increasing excellence of design as it applies to our whole national environment, especially in the fields of architecture and industrial design.

It is directed toward making the works of promising artists known to a wider audience, through museum exhibits in our smaller cities, those of less than 250,000 in population.

It is directed toward building up regional support of the arts, so that their values can be appreciated in local communities and at the grassroots level.

Are we to say that this program, which this Congress enthusiastically endorsed just a few months ago, is now unworthy of one ten-thousandth of 1 percent of our Federal budget?

The figure we are considering is less than that, in actuality.

Are we to say that the kind of civilization our men are now fighting for in Vietnam is not to be enriched here at home by this very modest support for the arts, which make the difference between a materialistic society and a truly creative one?

In this connection, may I remind my colleagues that in the darkest days of World War II, the British Government—with a budget far more limited than ours and under the gravest kind of duress—brought its Arts Council into being, to boost morale, to affirm that there is more to life than guns or butter and that the values of the human spirit and the creative mind are deserving of support, especially in times of crisis.

In view of the achievements that Council has brought to Great Britain, achievements which have been projected internationally throughout the free world—are we to call this action foolish, or misguided, or in error?

That is what we are discussing—the kind of civilization we want to make possible for the future of our own country, and the image we project beyond our own shores.

If there are those who choose to attack this program, and make this miniscule portion of the budget a special target; if there are those who wish to make this small but immensely meaningful program into a political football—let them remember the tens of thousands of people who have supported the concept of this program over the years and who have so eagerly awaited its arrival. Let them remember the leading members of the business community who serve as board directors for the many hundreds of arts organizations throughout our country, and who fully endorse this Foundation. Let them remember the strong support which labor is giving to this program—and the millions of our people it can benefit in the years to come.

And let them also remember that he who kicks a political football into the air is by no means invulnerable to receiving the final boot.

Mr. Chairman, I urge most strongly that the full amount recommended to us by the Appropriations Committee, the full amount we are considering today, be approved.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTI].

Mr. LATTI. Mr. Chairman, we have a problem in the United States that is growing by leaps and bounds and which is apparently being overlooked year after year. This year the Department of the Interior finally took a good hard look at it and came up with some recommendations. But the recommendations did not come forward until the bill was being marked up in committee. I refer to the blackbird and starling problem that we now have in the United States. This problem is tremendous. According to the Department of Interior, we are suffering losses in the United States now of roughly between \$50 million and \$100 million a year and primarily from the blackbird and starling problem. In the State of Ohio, we are suffering losses in excess of \$15 million.

I would like just briefly to go into the report of the Department of the Interior on the question of blackbird and starling problems:

## II. NATURE AND EXTENT OF LOSSES AND DAMAGE

**Agricultural losses:** The total economic losses attributable to birds have not been accurately determined but have been estimated to be between \$50 and \$100 million annually. Reports recently received from field offices of this Bureau indicate total damage by birds, other than game birds, of about \$58 million annually.

Losses caused by birds in New Jersey have been estimated at \$2½ to \$4 million annually, with corn damage being the major item. Estimated losses in New York, on the basis of incomplete reports, were comparable to those in New Jersey, with damage reported to orchards, vineyards, and corn.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that in the bill there is an amount of \$665,000 to eradicate blackbirds and starlings, and the Department of the Interior has said that until they find means to kill blackbirds and star-

lings without killing other species of birds they could not use any more money than that?

Mr. LATTI. No, I am not aware of that, and the report does not so indicate. The money to which the gentleman has referred, approximately \$660,000, has been in the budget for some time for research on methods to prevent crop deprivations and other losses caused by several different species of birds. I realize that such an appropriation has been made by the Congress year after year. I was coming to that later on. I am sorry the gentleman is attempting to confuse this appropriation with what I am attempting to do here to carry out a new recommendation of the Department to deal specifically with the blackbird and starling problem.

If I may now continue, the report states further:

Arkansas' rice losses have reached nearly \$1½ million. California reports an almost \$8 million annual loss from bird damage, extending over one-half million acres of crops.

In Ohio, annual losses from birds are predicted at about \$1 million annually, principally in field corn. One report from Ottawa County showed a loss in corn of somewhat more than \$100,000 in that county alone. Dr. Maurice L. Giltz, of the Ohio State University, recently reported that the value of corn sold for cash in that State, subject to damage by red-wing blackbirds, is estimated at \$15 million annually. In addition, corn subject to damage and used as feed amounts to many additional millions. He also reported that many large sums are spent by farmers in an attempt to prevent the destruction of their crops. These efforts, in spite of the outlay, have been only partially successful. A recent survey conducted by Dr. Giltz indicates that an average of somewhat more than \$5 per acre is spent to prevent destruction of the crop in those Ohio counties which experience persistent depredations. In addition to the direct damage to grain in the soft or milky stage, bird pecking is responsible for additional damage from molding, rotting, sprouting on the cob, and general failure of the grain to mature when direct damage reaches a critical degree.

Last year conventions of 15 farm bureaus passed resolutions urging assistance with bird problems. The American Farm Bureau Federation, at its national meeting in Chicago, Ill., on December 16, 1965, passed the following resolution, on which that organization is now acting:

## "WILDLIFE PESTS

"Blackbirds, starlings, and similar pests are causing serious damage to crops and property in many areas. They are a hazard to aviation and a carrier of diseases to humans as well as livestock.

"This problem is increasing over a wide geographic area. Intensive research efforts at State and Federal levels and prompt use of all practical recommendations and methods to eradicate these pests are fully justified.

"We recommend an action program under authorized personnel to control wildlife pests. Adequate funds should be made available to the Department of the Interior for this program."

The Colorado Department of Agriculture conducted a starling survey in 1963. Of the 400 respondents reporting, 32 percent stated they had no problem, 45 percent had a slight problem, and 23 percent have a major problem. They also predicted that the problem would become more serious in the future.

In 1962, 580 livestock operators in the North Central States were contacted through



a random selection by county agents. Sixty percent of those returning questionnaires indicated that starlings were a problem in their feeding operations during the winter months. Forty-six percent of those replying reported appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed by starlings.

A similar questionnaire in Missouri yielded generally similar results. From 100 responses, 55 percent reported that starlings were bothering their feeding operations during the winter months. Of those reporting starling damage, 48 percent reported an appreciable consumption and contamination of livestock feed. The information is significant because the response from the counties and feeders contacted was far greater than experienced in most surveys. It indicates much concern with the starling problem.

The October 1964 issue of the American Fruit Grower magazine states that growers in southwestern Michigan reported annual losses of about \$2¼ million worth of fruit from starling damage. Blueberry and cherry growers bore the brunt of the loss. The Journal of Economic Entomology, volume 51, No. 1, in an article titled "Some Factors Influencing the Infestation in Corn in the Field by the Rice Weevil," states:

"The main predisposing factor which influenced rice weevil infestations in the field in this study was bird damage to the husk. Corn ear worm damage alone was responsible for approximately 15 percent of the total damage, whereas the birds were responsible for 63 percent. The remainder of the damage was attributed to normal inherent characteristics of the corn."

So it goes all through this report, a report put out by the Department of the Interior, dated March 1966.

Getting to the problem that the gentleman mentioned here, about control, this is a problem that needs some additional funds, and the Department recognizes it. Turning to the Department's own recommendations in this report and its conclusion, it says:

The 1966 budget of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife includes \$660,000 for research on methods for preventing crop depredations and other losses caused by several different species of birds. In addition to this research effort, the Bureau is spending approximately \$170,000 annually to alleviate the bird damage problem.

Get this, my colleagues: they are spending \$170,000 annually to alleviate the bird damage problem which they themselves say is between \$50 and \$100 million annually, and in the State of Ohio alone is \$15 million.

Research at the present level will eventually produce improved methods; but the scope of present needs compel that these efforts be increased to provide needed solutions. These methods must be demonstrated and otherwise properly introduced to the public. An experienced cadre with technical, demonstrational, and investigative skills and experience is needed for this work. Accomplishment of these objectives would require an additional initial expenditure of \$1 million and 50 biologists (10 additional biologists in research and 40 for field programs). Of this amount, \$200,000 would finance additional control methods research, and \$800,000 would finance programs for dissemination and demonstration of the knowledge and techniques now available.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not true that in addition to direct damage to the corn crop, there is also damage to livestock through the spread of disease by blackbirds and starlings?

Mr. LATTA. The gentleman is absolutely correct. As he knows, tremendous damage has been caused in his district, and there have been stock diseases carried by these birds.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. As a matter of fact, in certain areas of my district, which are noted for hog production, several farmers have found it is no longer profitable to go into hog production partly because of diseases that are spread by these birds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to pursue this a little further and ask whether, in this chamber just yesterday, we did not hear a number of our colleagues discuss the question of the wheat that was going to be sent to India, that would be lost through consumption by monkeys and rats and the sacred cows of India, and whether it might not be a good investment for us to try to prevent that kind of damage in this country from birds?

Mr. LATTA. I could not agree with the gentleman more. I think that an investment of \$1 million for research to attempt to wipe out a \$58 million loss annually to our farmers would be a pretty good investment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Particularly at a time when we may face possible shortages in some of the crops that are being damaged.

Mr. LATTA. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask in conclusion, is it not true that this money would be spent to find ways to limit the predatory birds without damaging other wildlife and songbirds and other birds that we want to preserve?

Mr. LATTA. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, the Department is well aware of this problem. As indicated in their own report, from which I have been reading, they have—

First. A stepped-up action program to reduce damage in critical areas, relying heavily on compound DRC-1339 and decoy traps.

Second. A stepped-up research program aimed at finding techniques, chemicals, and other materials useful in coping with a variety of species causing a variety of problems.

Coming to my own State of Ohio, and particularly northwestern Ohio, I might say that a great many of our farmers, who have been producing corn for years and years, have had to cease raising corn because of extensive blackbird damage. I happen to have in my hand a picture which appeared in the Freemont News Messenger on Monday, March 28, 1966, which shows the blackbirds in flight from a field. The sky is almost black. This

picture shows what our farmers are subjected to.

I am glad to know that the Department of the Interior has recognized the seriousness of this problem and has finally come up with some recommendations. I am only sorry that they did not come up with these recommendations months ago, when many of my colleagues and I joined together in an appeal for relief.

The mere fact that the Department did not come forward with these recommendations until the committee was marking up the bill does not seem to me sufficient reason to delay this program for another year. I may say a number of States, according to the Department, including Ohio, now have existing programs. Through the Agricultural Extension Service and the game agency and other agencies in particular we have provided ways to reduce damage from birds. It is anticipated any extended program of the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife will be closely integrated with these existing programs. The details of how this integration will be worked out cannot be spelled out here. In any event, there will be no duplication of effort or competition with present efforts. Any increase in the Bureau's resources for this program could be used to supplement and strengthen the overall effort by all concerned. In all cases the Bureau would embark on a program of a State only—and I stress this—only after receiving a formal request to do so from the Governor or from an official authorized to represent them in this matter. Also, the program would be undertaken only after consummation of an agreement with the State.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I might tell the House that Ohio is taking such a step. According to an article which appears in the newspaper to which I referred earlier, Mr. Roy Kottman, director of the Ohio Research and Development Center at Wooster, outlined plans for a crash program this summer aimed at giving better control of the blackbird. He said that eight researchers are being assigned to the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Kottman said that the eight researchers being assigned to the project will be aided by other employees. The research center last week received \$12.5 million in emergency funds from the State of Ohio Controlling Board. The program is to receive the same amount in a later allocation. Mr. Kottman estimated that the blackbirds, primarily of the redwing type, destroyed about \$15 million in Ohio crops last summer, which is about 6 percent, of the State's \$225 million corn crop. We can no longer sit still. We have to get moving, because Ohio farmers cannot afford this kind of loss. Some farmers lose up to 15 percent of their crops as flocks of redwing blackbirds numbering in the tens of thousands invade their fields. In areas near Lake Erie, Mr. Kottman said, we have had a desperate problem during the last 10 years. The bird problem now



reaches into about 50 of our 88 counties in Ohio.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. CONTE. I am certainly very sympathetic to the plea that the gentleman from Ohio is making here. I think it makes a lot of sense. But I am wondering if the gentleman was here when his colleague, the ranking Republican minority member of the Committee on Appropriations took the floor earlier today and said he is going to offer an amendment to knock out all of these projects. He was saying it to the tune of "Bye Bye Blackbird."

Mr. LATTA. I do not know whether the gentleman makes this comment in order to play down the importance of this problem or not. I hope he does not. But certainly the gentleman to whom he refers, the ranking Republican on the Committee on Appropriations, is familiar with this problem. As I understand it, he himself brought the subject up at my request when this matter was being marked up in the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

(Mr. FASCELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, sufficient Federal aid to our commercial fisheries is of utmost importance. For with these funds we will be enabled to continue research into methods of increasing the amount of fish in man's diet.

In discussing the appropriation for our commercial fisheries for fiscal year 1967, I first wish to thank the Appropriations Subcommittee reporting this bill and its most able and distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] for taking a major step forward in this Nation's efforts to meet the growing world food and vitamin shortage. As you all know, the administration's budget request was for only \$3.2 million. The Appropriation Committee recommended \$4.7 million, or an increase of \$1.5 million for the program in 1967.

This higher level of funding will allow us to continue with important studies such as those in relation to the development of fish protein concentrate which holds such bright promise in alleviating the protein shortage in the diet of hundreds of millions of people. We must also remember that in addition to such specialized studies, these additional funds will enable the States to go forward with their full research program.

There will be some who will say, why spend the extra \$1.5 million. For the answer, take a look at the population predictions. Reportedly, the world's population is expected to more than double by the year 2000. Food even in the near future is surely going to be as scarce as many anticipate. Then we must get much more food from the ocean—the greatest remaining, least exploited, reservoir.

The world's fish catch, in 1964, set a new record of 51.6 million tons. It may

seem like a lot of fish, but actually it is not. The great bulk of the catch for one reason or another is not used for human food.

We here in the United States have made no progress, really in seafood consumption, in spite of important development in processing, storage, and marketing. In 1965, U.S. per capita consumption of fish, fresh, frozen, canned, and cured was only 10.6 pounds—almost exactly the same as in 1947–49 and 1957–59. We consumed more coffee per person in 1965, and also more beef, and chicken.

I mention these comparisons to indicate some of the untapped food potential which remains to be taken from the sea. Seafood and fishery consumption has lagged. The consumption lag has been due primarily because we, and others, have lagged in the attention we have given to this important matter.

I want very much to see the commercial fisheries of this country receive the attention that agriculture has received over the past several decades. In total, the investment in agriculture may be in the billions of dollars. Certainly it has paid off—no people anywhere are well fed for such a small portion of their labor time.

I think it is time that we intensified our efforts to revitalize our commercial fisheries. Back in 1964 we made an excellent start. We passed some monumental legislation for our ailing commercial fisheries. One of the acts, the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of May 20, 1964—Public Law 88-309—rightly gave rise to substantial expectations. Yet, what happened? Apparently we had slippage between authorization and full activation. We lost 1 full year of appropriation because no appropriation for aid to the States was made for fiscal year 1965. During the second year of the program the President's budget request for commercial fisheries research was for \$2.6 million which the Congress raised to \$4.1 million.

Mr. Chairman, these funds for research and development of our commercial fisheries represent seed dollars—dollars for research, dollars for development and dollars for marketing a woefully neglected resource on which greatly increased demands may reasonably be anticipated very soon. These dollars will not be wasted. They will be repaid many times over in increased quantities of high-quality food.

I urge my colleagues to support the appropriations for our commercial fisheries at the level permitted under existing legislation.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my friend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] and the members of his subcommittee for bringing out a very good bill. It is a prudent bill and below the budget estimate, and all House Members should support it. I am especially pleased that the Committee has seen fit to approve the budget items for the Shawnee Na-

tional Forest and the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge in southern Illinois. I want to thank the Committee for seeing the need and granting our request, to start work on the Lusk Creek Lake project in the Shawnee National Forest by including a \$50,000 appropriation for this important work. The Federal Government owns more than a third of the land area of Pope County, Ill., where this project is to be located and the payment in lieu of taxes is small from the sale of timber, therefore, this project is badly needed in order to provide more revenues to these hard hit counties, supply a balanced recreational program for the southeastern part of Illinois and improve the national program of this administration to provide more outdoor recreational areas for our growing population.

I want to thank the U.S. Forest Service for their help on this project and again thank this distinguished Committee.

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

(Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments that will be offered later by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. Chairman, these projects that were added were added because the members of the committee thought they were good and thought they were proper. It is my sincere belief that they should remain in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, it is foolish to think that if the budget is cut as it has been here, 3 percent, that they are going to further cut that budget in order to take care of these 41 projects that have been added. They just will not do it.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

(Mr. EDMONDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding, and I want to thank the subcommittee for the language which has been placed in the report on pages 8 and 9 with reference to a construction start on the school at Eufala, Okla., and with reference to the agricultural extension program for the Indians in Oklahoma.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask for a clarification from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], a question with reference to the language which appears on page 8 of the report which states as follows:

The committee recommends that the agriculture extension program in Oklahoma be funded at a \$100,000 level in 1967, with funds reprogrammed from the mutual help and low-rent housing program.

What I would like to know is this: Whether this refers to the national funds



for mutual help and low-rent housing program, or to the sum provided for the State of Oklahoma alone?

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. That refers to the national fund, and not to the amount provided for the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the chairman very much.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

(Mr. GIAIMO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to commend the subcommittee which has reported out this legislation. It is my opinion that they have done a fine job here, and I particularly would like to address myself to one problem which I believe is going to confront us as we discuss this legislation. That problem is with reference to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, today as we consider the budget for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, I think it is well to keep in mind the stated purpose of this institution, "to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the humanities and the arts in the United States."

The Subcommittee on Department of the Interior and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, has recommended an appropriation of \$7 million, a reduction of \$6,930,000 below the budget estimate of \$13,930,000. The money that is left in the appropriation has been scrutinized even further with expressions of doubt as to the validity of certain grants to individuals and organizations. There seems to be much concern as to who should approve what projects applying for aid from the Arts and Humanities Foundation.

Mr. Chairman, to continue to cut the budget of the Arts and Humanities Foundation is to cut dangerously near the point of leaving the foundation impotent and unable to carry out its purpose. If we continue to advance the argument that the foundation is in its infancy and refuse to let it grow, then we are acting like the parent who refuses to let his child mature.

It is certainly the job of the committee to see that funds appropriated for the operation of the Foundation are not misused or used to show disregard of the programs outlined before it. But I think that prudence and an obligation to act responsibly requires that the committee and this Congress permit the Foundation the opportunity to prove its worth and the value of its program.

The creation of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities is a credit to this Nation and to the men and women who have worked with dedication to bring it about. It is testimony that we can build beauty as well as bombs.

We have splendid opportunity in the National Foundation on the Arts and

Humanities, and we should give it the support and the opportunity to function.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would today resist any attempts to cut further the moneys appropriated for this Foundation.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYATT].

(Mr. WYATT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Chairman, the Willamette Falls Fishway project at Willamette Falls in Oregon, is considered by the Fish and Wildlife Service as the most important single project dealing with the perpetuation of salmon and steelhead runs in the entire Columbia River system. It is accurately estimated that the annual benefit accruing to the various commercial fisheries, sports fisheries, along the Pacific Coast from this development would approximate \$4 million annually.

In 1904 fishways were built at Willamette Falls for salmon and steelhead passage. These are now antiquated. In the intervening 62 years new fish ladder techniques have been developed, industrial useage and pollution have made the problem of fish passage more critical, and these ancient fish ladders have deteriorated to the point that they are not much help to the migrant fish population.

At the present, movement of fish over the falls through the old fishway is possible only during a very limited time when water flows are moderate. Fish are delayed on their upstream journey at the falls by high flows, and cannot find or enter the present ladder during low flows.

Last year Congress appropriated \$600,000 for construction of phase A of the Willamette Falls Fishways project and the contract for construction of phase A has been awarded. It is vitally necessary now that funds for construction of phase B of the project be made available. Based upon the cost of phase A, it is now estimated that the total cost of the Willamette Falls Fishways project is \$3,200,000.

Private industry is providing 16.3-percent financing for actual construction of this project, and in accordance with the Federal Power Commission's findings, industry should make available approximately \$510,000 for those items for which it has been established that industry has partial responsibility.

It is absolutely essential and vital that funds which are now included in this bill be appropriated in fiscal year 1967 to provide for continued construction of the Willamette Falls Fishways project. There is absolutely no question but that the Federal Government has never had such an opportunity for such a sound business proposition. The total cost of the Willamette Falls Fishways project will be \$3,200,000 but the annual benefits to be derived from this project will approximate \$4 million annually.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HORTON].

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the item contained in the pending bill to provide support for the arts endowment of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I think it is both wise and proper to approve this initial appropriation at this time so that we can begin to move forward with our program of national patronage for the performing and creative arts in America.

For a long time I have been a supporter of the concept of Federal encouragement for the arts. Last year in the first session of this current 89th Congress, I was pleased to be among the House sponsors of legislation that created the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The reasons I advanced at the time we authorized the establishment of this body are the same I now offer in support of an appropriation.

As a cultured country, we have moved at an astonishingly slow pace to enhance our indigenous art forms. Many other nations of the world are far ahead of us in this respect and the strength and viability of their arts provide proof of the value inherent in government patronage.

While we have these world examples of what can be accomplished by public agencies lending their interest to the arts, we also have a closer-to-home demonstration of what government help can mean to educational endeavors. The National Science Foundation has strengthened science in the United States to a considerable degree. It has done so without Government control, as well.

I am well acquainted with the response received from the scientific community to the help provided by the National Science Foundation. Many of its grants go to the University of Rochester where researcher after researcher has reported to me on the new scientific vistas which are opened by this aid.

In addition to the honor I feel in representing some of the Nation's eminent scientists, I also feel a similar privilege in my representation of some of our country's greats in the field of art. The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] with whom I have worked so very closely in this legislative area kindly called my home community of Rochester, N.Y. "one of the bright spots on the cultural landscape" of this country.

As many of my colleagues know, Rochester is synonymous with the finest in music education, symphonic presentations, ballet troupes, art and sculpture exhibitions, the art of photography, and in all the allied activities of American art. Those who are close to these concerns in Rochester and its environs have discussed with me on frequent occasions the promise they feel is held out by Federal patronage.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, one of the local organizations with which I have cooperated in this regard, the Ars Antiqua Society, asked me to author an article



for one of its recent newsletters on the subject of the Arts and Humanities Act. Because it expresses my feelings on this measure and by extension voices my views on the desirability of approving this appropriation before us, I ask that it be printed with my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Members of this body will see fit to keep the amount appropriated for the Arts and Humanities intact, and will resist all efforts to reduce it.

#### THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT

(NOTE.—In September, amidst a ceremony in the White House rose garden, President Johnson signed into law the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. This bill was introduced and sponsored by Congressman FRANK HORTON. We are proud of his achievement and are pleased to print the following article.)

(Written exclusively for *Ars Antiqua Society* by Congressman FRANK HORTON, 36th District of New York)

It is my strong conviction that the arts and humanities are matters of crucial importance to our society. Those qualities which make us wiser, more humane, more understanding and more appreciative of beauty and truth are the products of a deep kinship with the arts and humanities and a flourishing cultural life. I believe that these are the qualities which must be sought in greater measure to realize national success and individual fulfillment. While the arts and humanities, through the ages, have sustained man at his most profound level of being, we are growing increasingly aware of the need for their broader and deeper influence. More and more, we recognize their values not only in terms of national prestige, utilization of leisure time, but also as a necessity for man in an age of science and technology.

As significant as a rich cultural environment may be, the evidence is quite clear that our cultural development lags far behind scientific development and that support and encouragement for the arts and humanities must be increased to satisfy requirements for expansion and excellence in these areas. Convinced that the arts and humanities have a role equal in importance to the national interest as science, I am concerned over the existing imbalance in our national life and feel that the Federal Government has a responsibility for giving limited, but constructive support and encouragement for the development of our cultural resources. Because of the magnitude of the issues and the needs, I have supported arts legislation in the past. This year I introduced legislation pertaining to the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and have testified on its behalf and actively worked to win prompt and positive action on the measure.

The Foundation proposals have received enthusiastic support in the Congress and from the various sectors of our society. In my opinion the establishment of a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities will provide vital recognition and support for the arts and humanities while guaranteeing maximum independence and freedom from improper Federal control. Moreover, the creation of such a foundation would signify to the Nation and the world that a free society values and is capable of sustaining a rich cultural life.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN].

(Mr. KUPFERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities and the appropriation therefor in the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967, being H.R. 14215.

Perhaps the best example to demonstrate that governmental support and assistance serves to stimulate private funding for the arts is contained in the 4-year history of the New York State Council on the Arts.

The council began its activities with a survey of needs. During its first year—1961-62—the council operated with a budget of \$450,000 over 70 percent of which was supplied by its State appropriation, the remainder coming from private sources. During 1964-65, the ratio was entirely reversed, with almost 75 percent of a larger budget—\$562,000—coming from private funding and the remainder from the State. The council's appropriation in 1961-62 was \$330,000; in 1964-65, this has been more than halved—to \$153,000.

During the same period, the number of communities served by the council doubled, from 46 to 92; the number of performances tripled, 92 to 277; and the number of touring companies aided by the council increased almost twelvefold, from 6 to 71—from the testimony of John Hightower, executive director of the council.

A special report prepared for the U.S. Office of Education and printed in the hearings calls the New York State Council on the Arts "the most developed State council in the country," and continues:

New York has also amply demonstrated that a State can assist and further the arts without loss of freedom—without setting up controls.

The bill is intended to encourage this type of State activity in the arts throughout the whole of the United States.

A great deal of what needs to be said in this field has been previously said by my predecessor, John V. Lindsay, now mayor of New York City. He was the coauthor of the arts council bill, and, in support of it, in this body stated on August 20, 1964, as follows:

STATEMENT BY FORMER REPRESENTATIVE JOHN V. LINDSAY, REPUBLICAN, OF NEW YORK, ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 20, 1964

I rise in support of this bill, sometimes known as the Thompson-Lindsay arts council bill. It is an important proposal. It is the basis for national recognition of a great national good.

The background for this proposal should be reviewed and the matter put in full perspective.

The idea that the Federal Government should assume a role in the encouragement of the arts is not new; but in recent years, it has been a source of heated controversy and profound misunderstanding. Certainly, the growth and development of the fine arts in the United States are in the national interest. We are continually engaged in an effort to strengthen our national security. Surely it is also in the national well-being to enhance the cultural life of our civilization.

What is the basis from which I speak today? It is my great privilege to represent in

Congress the area in New York which is undoubtedly the leading hub of cultural activity in the United States. Within the bounds of the district are the Metropolitan Opera, Carnegie Hall, Broadway's Great White Way, the New York City Ballet, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the New York Public Library, the Seagram Building, the Guggenheim Museum, Greenwich Village, Yorkville, Gramercy Park, Rockefeller Center, the New York Coliseum, Central Park, Cooper Union, New York University, the United Nations, Union Square—the centers of book and music publishing, the Nation's leading daily press, advertising, all major national radio and TV networks, scores of galleries, bookshops, and coffeehouses. The list could be extended indefinitely.

There is mounting evidence of increased interest in the arts in America. I am impressed and heartened by such signposts as the growth of the quality paperback, by the increase in symphony orchestras, and by the increased patronage of our Nation's art galleries. It must be pointed out, however, that while these hopeful signs are indicative of increased cultural consumption, they do not indicate that the creative climate is as healthy as it should be.

I think it is fair to state that our national leaders expressed a more profound concern with the growth and development of the fine arts in the early years of the country than they do today.

For example, George Washington in his first annual address to the Congress, January 8, 1790, declared "that there is nothing which can better deserve our patronage than the promotion of science and literature." John Quincy Adams in his first message to Congress called for the founding of a national university and for the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences, and literature.

In 1846, the Smithsonian Institution was created to take advantage of a bequest of James Smithson to the United States. The Institution has expanded over the years and now includes no less than 10 bureaus, 4 of which are directly concerned with the arts: the U.S. National Museum, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery—which operates only partly on Federal funds—and the world-renowned National Gallery of Art.

In 1910, Congress created the Commission of Fine Arts as guardian for the L'Enfant plan for the development of the District of Columbia.

The Library of Congress operates a music division which not only collects material relating to music, but also conducts a performance program.

The General Services Administration is charged, among other things, with the responsibility of design and construction of all public and administrative buildings of the Federal Government. Its annual payments to architects, muralists, sculptors, and painters are considerable.

For many years the Department of Agriculture has had a program of making and using motion pictures in its educational program.

The National Park Service has a program for the conservation of our national historic and architectural monuments.

The Office of Education has several specialists serving in areas related to the arts.

The Department of State has engaged in cultural enterprises for a number of years. Particularly since World War II under the foreign building program, the Department has brought in leading architects to design many of our new embassy buildings. Under our educational and cultural exchange program, representatives of our artistic community have traveled throughout the world, testifying to the vitality of our national life.



So it is clear that Federal participation in the arts is hardly a new development. It has gone on with a large degree of success for many years. The hostility that has been expressed to a Federal entry is justified only when one examines the problem of Government control.

Institutions of American culture are confronted with a number of difficulties, the greatest of which is financial instability. No one embarks on a career in the arts to secure a "comfortable" existence as long as there exists a scarcity of opportunities and a surplus of hopefuls seeking them.

As the House hearings on this subject held in 1961 pointed out, production costs have far outpaced reasonably available revenues, and great patrons of the arts who once gave of their personal fortunes to support cultural activities are disappearing.

How then can we as a nation help to restore these institutions to financial vitality and to give the individual artist an opportunity to do what long and arduous years of training have prepared him to do?

It seems clear that Federal subsidies to the arts are not necessarily the answer to artistic development in this country. Rather the role of an enlightened citizenry is of paramount importance. It is the responsibility of individuals in all parts of the country—the general public as well as the wealthy patrons and benefactors—to provide the principal basis of support for the artistic community. Private enterprise, and the American labor movement, too, must continue to bear a heavy share of this responsibility. There has been heartening progress in this area in recent years. Let us hope that it continues.

Further, financial support is only part of the problem. The function of the Federal Government should be to create healthy environmental conditions so that the arts can grow and flourish. Too often, Government, through such restraints as inequitable tax treatment, actually hinders artistic expression and surrounds the practice of the arts with unnecessary restrictions.

A number of State and local governments are providing increased assistance to the arts, and it is to them that we can turn to observe some of the more hopeful developments in the relationship between Government and the arts. A number of cities and States already have established executive offices whose purpose it is to give due recognition and status to the arts. New York State, under Governor Rockefeller, has developed one of the best. Many more are developing programs for the systematic improvement of the arts. It is on the local level that these programs should begin, for it is there that community resources for private participation can be best utilized.

The New York State Council on the Arts has been a great success in fostering and encouraging the arts, and in the words of Governor Rockefeller is "providing a pattern for emulation both for the Federal Government and for many of our States."

As I have stated, the Federal Government has taken an active role in support of the arts for a number of years. There is nothing new about this. However, widespread confusion exists because many people mistakenly assume that all Federal assistance to the arts must necessarily involve direct subsidies. In my opinion, subsidies are not the first order of business. The Government's best role is to make certain that the environmental conditions exist which will permit the arts to grow, advance, and flourish on their own. Recognition of the importance of the arts as a national good is important.

The step that the Federal Government should take at this time in order to give this recognition and to coordinate the existing Federal involvement in the arts is to establish a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts.

Three administrations—Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson—have called for the creation of such a council. I have pressed for it over since I have been in Congress. It has always been a bipartisan proposal and has received widespread support throughout the country.

As I have pointed out many times, the proposed council would have no authority or funds to dole out subsidies. The cost for its first year of operation would be extremely modest.

The structure and membership of the Council is defined in the Thompson-Lindsay bill. There is a Chairman and 24 members. The Chairman is full time and paid. The others are not. Certainly, the Council should be composed of individuals with broad judgment and the finest credentials. The Council would have the power to study the state of cultural resources in the United States, to propose methods of increasing private initiative in the arts, to support increased cooperation among local, State, and Federal departments and agencies and to foster greater activity in the forms and practice of the arts.

The Arts Council bill is only one form of recognition. Again, what I am talking about is indirect assistance, not direct.

There are other steps that should be taken. The Federal Government should remove unnecessary restrictions upon the creation, practice, and appreciation of the arts in America. Federal tax relief is therefore essential. I have long urged that the Federal Government repeal its 10-percent admissions tax on live dramatic performances. The resultant saving would eventually be passed on to the public in the form of lower ticket prices. Indeed it would have to be passed on as there has been a sharp drop off in public attendance. It would result in the creation and production of more and better plays, musical performances, and symphony and opera for the benefit of our citizens. Just recently I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in support of my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, pointing out the distressed condition of the New York theater, center of the Nation's cultural life. Without tax relief, the New York theater may find itself in a very serious position as it opens its new season in the fall. I had with me two show business constituents, Mr. Hal Prince, producer of such Broadway shows as "Pajama Game," "Damn Yankees," "West Side Story," and so forth, and Mr. David Merrick, producer of "Hello Dolly," "Carnival," "Oliver," who joined me in testimony of the seriousness of the financial situation of the theater.

Unfortunately, the Treasury Department persists in lumping the dramatic arts together with other failing industries. To the Treasury, the dramatic and musical arts, shooting galleries, dog races, and flea circuses are all the same. The Treasury Department retains the hidebound view that what is right for an industrial organization is right for the theater industry. Naturally, this position is conveniently overlooked when the Government, in response to Soviet competition, uses our arts as instruments of foreign policy in our cultural exchanges program. But the Treasury Department fails to recognize that without a healthy environment for the creation of new plays, new works of music, and the like, there would be little or nothing to export. If this is the view of the Government, then it is placing a strong barrier in the way of a free and healthy creative climate.

Another change in the tax law which I have sought to bring about through legislation is more equitable tax treatment to authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions in the event that they sell the rights to their works. Under present law, tax treatment for authors of literary, musical, or artistic compositions is dis-

criminatory. Benefit of capital gains tax treatment is given to the author of a patent in order to stimulate inventive activity. We should have a comparable means of stimulating literary, musical, and artistic creation. The bill (H.R. 2519) would repeal the exclusions which presently prohibit copyrights and literary, musical and artistic compositions from considerations as capital assets. The bill further provides that transfer of copyrights or composition rights in the hands of the creator shall be considered a sale or exchange of a capital asset. Under present law such sales are taxed as ordinary income. Persons who acquire an interest in such property from the creator prior to the substantial completion of the copyrighted work would also receive this treatment. In order to avoid difficulties which could arise in the operation of this legislation, two limitations have been written into the bill. A transfer would apply only with respect to work that has been substantially completed. Second, only one copyright or composition of a taxpayer year would be eligible for this treatment. This bill came very close to being reported out by the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress. It was stopped by the administration, which lobbied long, diligently, and senselessly against it.

A third area which has merited remedial action is the problem of authors, composers, artists including performing artists who receive income in fluctuating amounts from year to year and whose earnings may be concentrated in a comparatively short period while the completion of the work itself may have taken several years. I introduced a bill (H.R. 2520) which would permit writers, musicians, and artists to spread the compensation that they receive from a work of art over the period in which they have worked on the project in computing the tax on this income.

I was pleased, therefore, when the tax bill in this Congress gave recognition to the problem and contained a limited "averaging out" provision. The bill did not give the relief afforded under my bill. The bill enacted does not deal with unused deductions and exemptions, and with small income variations.

Another proposal which I believe has great merit, long sponsored by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], a veteran member of the Committee on Ways and Means, would provide a charitable contribution deduction of up to 30 percent for contributions by an individual to nonprofit museums, libraries, and other facilities in support of the arts. Under present Federal income tax law, a deduction for charitable contributions by an individual is limited to 20 percent of his adjusted income in all cases except gifts to churches, schools, and colleges, and certain types of hospitals and medical research organizations where the limitation is 30 percent. The proposed legislation would permit an added 10 percent to libraries and museums of art, history, or science. John D. Rockefeller III has suggested that opera, symphony orchestra, ballet, repertory drama, and community art centers also be included. All these suggestions which have been proposed to aid the arts either through tax and tariff relief—the Tariff Act could well be liberalized with respect to the importation of works of art, the construction of physical plants (buildings, concert halls, and the like)—should receive the closest and most detailed study from an advisory council on the arts. We could all benefit from the increased understanding that would result.

In the course of these remarks, I have pointed to much that is hopeful in the artistic taste and expression of this Nation. But for all that is full of promise, there is much that is shoddy and distressing. Bad city planning has crowded out reason and justice. New construction too often destroys the good with the bad. Roads encroach upon precious solitude. Entertain-



ment often aims at the lowest common denominator. These may afford satisfaction for the moment but how much will endure? Artistic endeavor in America must not be judged by false or ersatz criteria. When we mistake the package for the product, the shadow for the substance, quantity for quality, and consumption for creation, we do ourselves a disservice as a nation.

The great ages in the life of a civilization have been those in which the arts have flourished. The Age of Pericles in democratic Athens was as noted for its philosophers, sculptors, and playwrights as for its generals and statesmen. We should not forget this. It was hardly an accident. The quality of a society is measured as much by its culture as its political and economic attainments.

This bill, then, represents an important effort to recognize the arts in the United States as a "national good." It is designed to pull together what at present is a scattered Federal concern. It is designed to give status to the concern and care of our National Government. It is a bill that has great merit and should be supported.

In an article in the *Saturday Review* of March 13, 1965, entitled "A Congressman Looks at the Arts," Mayor Lindsay stated:

#### A CONGRESSMAN LOOKS AT THE ARTS

(By Hon. John V. Lindsay)

Increasingly, it seems to be an accepted fact that the arts, and especially the performing arts, are a "good thing" for the community and the country. Four years ago Congressman FRANK THOMPSON and I were defeated on the floor of the House of Representatives in our attempt to put through a simple National Arts Council bill—a non-money bill that one would have thought generally noncontroversial. We were defeated on the ground that the arts and their general condition is no business of any government. One powerful Congressman denounced the bill as the opening wedge toward subsidy of poker games.

Only 3 years later, however, in 1964, we put the National Arts Council bill through the House of Representatives by an astonishingly large majority. It must also have surprised the administration, for it took the President 6 months to appoint the Council.

The Council's main job, of course, is to make a determination of where we go from here. What is the role of government in the arts? Is it possible to create a national goal to which the country will aspire? If organized society has an obligation to do something about the health of its people, or their education, cannot the same be said of the country's cultural resources? If the arts are one of the central elements of a good society and an important part of an individual's betterment, a source of strength to him, his family, and his community, is it not true that the health of the arts should be of concern to the elected and appointed representatives of that society?

The subject is considered important today where it was not 4 years ago. Something has happened to the politicians since that first unsuccessful foray. I suspect that they have been hearing from the housewives in their constituencies, who, happily, are beginning to become as excited about the condition of the local drama society as they are about the price of butter. More than 100 bills have been introduced in this 89th Congress for the purpose of supplying small measures of Federal financial support for the arts (unheard of), on a matching basis, to States and localities.

At the recent congressional hearings on the subject all kinds of testimony was presented in support of a Federal Foundation on the Arts; even Congressmen who would have left the floor in dismay 4 years ago were now

declaring themselves in favor of it. Then, too, there has been a spate of State arts councils modeled after the pioneers in the field—New York, North Carolina, and Louisiana.

I'm still wondering, however, exactly where we go from here. We are dealing with an area so highly personal and individual and unorganized (fortunately), so experimental (again fortunately) and sensitive, that one treads cautiously where Government involvement is concerned. But granted the sensitive and personal nature of creativity, there are nevertheless some nasty unsolved problems of brick and mortar and boilerplate that make creativity unnecessarily more difficult. In the performing arts especially, all kinds of problems of business and administration, taxes and real estate, wage scales and other union requirements, foreign competition and costs in general are involved. There is no reason why these problems cannot be lessened, but any progress will require a very exact knowledge of the industry.

I have discovered, in researching this subject, that knowledge is hard to come by, that the discovery of facts and full information is most difficult. That is one of the several reasons that I am excited by the new Rockefeller panel report, "The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects." This was a blue-ribbon panel, so good and so responsible that I could not mention some of its members without calamitous omission; let me only say that John D. Rockefeller III, who has given luster and strength to the performing arts in New York City, was its chairman.

Fascinating stuff in this report. Did you know, for example, that in 1963, of the \$10 billion that was contributed by Americans to all charities, 78.6 percent was contributed by individuals, as opposed to 8.2 percent by foundations, 7.9 percent by wills and last testaments, and 5.3 percent by business corporations? I had begun to think that the foundations were the sources of all nongovernmental beneficence in this area. "Nothing could be further from the truth," concludes the panel. "For arts organizations to turn to foundations, large or small, in hope that their needs will be swiftly satisfied, is almost certain to lead to disappointment." Many of my constituents who have come to me for an introduction to a foundation, hoping for financial support for a worthy artistic endeavor, will sadly bear out the point.

And did you know that of the \$7.8 billion in individual contributions, more than 50 percent comes from those with adjusted gross incomes below \$10,000, and that those in the lower income brackets give higher proportions of their incomes than all taxpayers except those in the very high brackets? There have been some shifts in recent years that are interesting, too. For example, in the 5-year period from 1958 to 1963, individual giving to charities, increased by 39 percent, foundation giving by 62 percent, and bequests by 77 percent, while corporate contributions rose by only 2 percent, despite the fact that over the 5-year period corporate income before taxes increased by approximately one-third.

The beneficiaries of these sums are just as important to one's understanding as are the sources. In 1963 the \$10 billion received from all sources, included the \$7.8 billion from individuals, was distributed as follows: religion, 49 percent; education, 17 percent; welfare, 15 percent; health, 12 percent; paid into foundations, 4 percent; and all other, including civic and cultural, 3 percent.

Lest anyone still think that we are in good shape, however, one need only take a look at a few other figures. The average salary in orchestras in the United States ranges from \$2,000 to \$9,000. Actor's Equity estimated in a survey taken for the years 1957-58 that of nearly 7,000 members of its association employed as performers, the average actor's annual income approximated \$2,000.

Clearly salaries have advanced since those years, but they remain indecently low. They are, however, still ahead of salaries in the dance, where it is estimated that \$3,000 to \$3,500 a year is the average income for a professional dancer (and he would be fortunate if this were steady from year to year). A prima ballerina can today hope for little more than \$10,000 a year. The prodigious cost of the opera is well known. The outpouring of money for 1964-65 for the New York Metropolitan Opera was over \$9 million and the end is not in sight.

Cost is, of course, the continuing crisis for all of the performing arts. The theater is the only one that has survived as a commercial enterprise and has been thought capable of self-support, and yet about 75 percent of all Broadway productions fail to make money, and Broadway's output has dwindled from an average of 142 productions per year during the thirties to a mere 63 in 1963-64. No new theater has been built on Broadway since 1938.

There is, of course, the cultural explosion that one hears is going on in the small towns of America. The Rockefeller brothers panel report finds that it is real and good and healthy, but it concludes that the explosion is largely amateur. It needs professionalism and management and money if there is to be a higher appreciation and a wider understanding and enjoyment of the performing arts at their best.

The Rockefeller brothers panel makes the finding that one of the shortages has been information itself. This report supplies a good deal of information that has been lacking and for that reason alone is worthy of wide notice.

The final conclusion of the distinguished panelists is that even though so much new interest in the performing arts has been shown in America, it is surprising and shocking that the lag in the artistic excellence and the commitment of our people to its betterment remains so great. There are increasing initiatives by universities, communities, choral groups, and amateur undertakings, and there are great efforts by foundations and men and women of wonderful good will in every community who give of themselves and their resources for the construction of a local music, drama, or dance center. But still there is a colossal gap between what there is and what there should be.

What can be done about it? The panelists find that the energy must come from every direction. Most especially it must come from private sources and private initiatives. And it must come from States and municipalities, which must do much more than they have been willing to do to date. Lastly, the Federal Government has a limited but important role to play; this role will include financial giving, preferably on a matching basis, and tax relief. At all times, of course, the independence of the arts, their freedom of choice and decision, must be maintained. And there is the rub. But it can be done; it's been done elsewhere and there's no reason why it can't be done here.

With great increases in leisure time, and pressure on all sides to make room for an expanding population, it seems more important than ever to take a look at the needs of the inner man, his outward well-being having been generally accepted as a social goal.

It is almost trite to suggest that the mark of a civilization is the state of its culture, but unless the point is carefully understood there will be no advance. It seems beyond further doubt that society cannot ignore its cultural well being any more than it can the condition of its health or education. Any course of conduct to the contrary is sheer folly and will show up as such by the example of other civilizations and countries, to our ultimate shock and loss. Therefore,



It is incumbent upon us to get on with the job; to beef up our municipal, State, and local art centers and advisory councils; to give proper national recognition by appropriate and additional national legislation; to strip away the tax, real estate, and other barriers that stand in the way of artistic growth; to advance our copyright laws and and other protections for creative artists and authors; to encourage our schools and colleges to begin early and complete training in the performing arts; and to encourage and make possible the widest possible enjoyment of the performing arts in every community.

Even in the best of his own campaign for mayor in the fall of 1965, Mayor Lindsay took the time to appear in this body, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 15, 1965, and to state:

Last year Congress authorized the formation of the National Arts Council to study the role of Government in the arts.

The bill before the House today goes much further. It establishes a national foundation to provide Federal financial aid to such activities as opera, dance, drama, painting, literature, and allied fields.

At the same time, it makes it quite clear that such aid will not involve any Federal control of the recipients. I plan to vote for this bill because I believe that culture in this country is in serious trouble.

Let us review the state of the arts:

On August 10, a cultural phenomena took place in New York City's Central Park: 70,000 New Yorkers tramped out to hear the New York Philharmonic play "Beethoven's Ninth Symphony." The crowd exceeded any that the Philharmonic had played before. It more than doubled the attendance at the game between the Minnesota Twins and the Yankees the same night. It topped the gathering of 55,000 teenagers which rocked to the Beatles 5 days later at Shea Stadium.

The crowd in the park was an impressive indication of the potential audience for the arts in this country.

A recent Rockefeller fund report cites some others: There are twice as many opera groups—754—in the United States as there were a decade ago; in the same period the number of theatrical enterprises has risen by 15 percent to 40,000; the number of symphony orchestras is now 1,400, double the number in 1939.

The statistics indicate that culture is doing pretty well in this country. Not so, said the report.

Almost all of the recent expansion in the arts has been amateur. Only 54 of the symphony orchestras are professional. Only one dance company in the Nation operates year round. Over the past 40 years the number of commercial theaters has dropped from nearly 600 to barely 200.

A few more figures: The average annual salary in our orchestras ranges from \$2,000 to \$9,000; many professional musicians earn only a few hundred dollars a year from concerts.

Professional dancers average only about \$3,500 a year, and the prima ballerina can today hope for little more than \$10,000.

The prodigious cost of opera is well known; the New York Metropolitan Opera required more than \$9 million last season.

Cost obviously, is the continuing crisis of the performing arts.

The Broadway theater is the only one that has proved remotely capable of self-support through the box office. Yet about 75 percent of all Broadway productions lose money; fewer than half as many plays are produced on Broadway each year as there were during the 1930's. Few are serious dramas. No new theater has been built on Broadway since 1939.

Performing arts can and do earn substantial income through ticket sales. But it was the conclusion of the Rockefeller report, however, that the arts cannot be logically expected to pay their way at the box office.

Somehow the gap between expenses and income at the box office must be made up by contributions, most of them from the private sector of the economy—individuals, foundations, corporations.

States and municipalities must do more. Most States would do well to follow my own New York, which under Governor Rockefeller's leadership spends nearly \$600,000 a year to bring theater, opera, and symphonies to small towns all over the State.

I have sponsored legislation to help the arts since I entered Congress in 1959.

Only a National Arts Council has been approved thus far. Now, however, I believe that more meaningful Federal participation is needed—specifically, money.

To date, Federal support of the arts has been largely ancillary. The State Department's cultural exchange program is one illustration.

The few direct Federal artistic activities, such as the National Museum, the National Collection of Fine Arts, the Freer Gallery, are fine, but are concentrated in Washington, D.C.

Society cannot ignore its cultural well-being any more than its schools or hospitals. The arts, therefore, are the proper concern of the elected representatives of that society.

Parenthetically, I no longer hear much about that premise. But I well remember an arts council bill I cosponsored to 1959 being denounced by a powerful Congressman as the opening wedge toward subsidized poker games.

Our early Presidents were conscious of the responsibility toward the arts. John Quincy Adams, in his first annual address to Congress, called for the passage of laws for the encouragement of the arts, sciences, and literature.

It would be gratifying to President Adams that the House has been considering precisely such a law. For myself, I am gratified that the bill before us includes virtually all the proposals I have urged for the past 6 years.

Basically, the bill provides for establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities which would parallel the National Science Foundation.

Under the Foundation, a national endowment for the arts will carry out a program of Federal grants to groups or individuals in the arts, enabling them to put on professional productions which, without such assistance, would have been unavailable to Americans.

A similar national endowment for the humanities will award grants and fellowships in language, literature, history, philosophy, and the other fields. During fiscal 1966 each endowment will have \$5 million to award, plus an equal sum to match certain private and State contributions.

To those who are concerned that Federal aid means Federal control, I call attention to that section of the bill which expressly forbids any department, agency, or employee of the United States from exercising any supervision or control over the policies, personnel, or operation of any non-Federal group dealing with the Foundation.

No statement, it seems to me, could more definitely delineate the Government's role in this program. With this safeguard, the small sums proposed can do much to cure the malaise afflicting the arts in the United States.

A nation's culture is its soul. Its enhancement enriches us all.

Mr. Chairman, with the record thus set forth, it would be unthinkable not to continue the appropriation for the National Council on the Arts and Humanities.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of full funding for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I think it is unfortunate that the direct grants have been cut from \$5 to \$4 million and assistance to the States from \$2.7 to \$2 million under the endowment for the arts.

This means the matching funds available to the individual States will be cut from \$50,000 to \$36,000.

The overall amount for the encouragement of the arts and humanities is modest. This effort enjoys bipartisan support. It is a beginning program. It is a seed program. The funds for the States in particular are basic in my judgment to the encouragement of private or local initiative in the arts.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I hope that a principle will be made clear here today that is basic and of paramount importance—autonomy for the arts. The Congress must be disinterested as between particular grants. There must be a clear insulation from Federal control and from the dead hand of the Government. Congress should support the arts in my judgment, but without attempting to influence artistic judgment or direction.

The Congress must not interpose its ideas on artistic questions. This should be left entirely to the talented and public spirited men and women who serve on the National Council on the Arts and its several distinguished panels on the theater, the dance, and the visual arts.

The Congress has the right and clearly so to appropriate funds for the encouragement of the arts, but we should not deal with specific grants which, in my judgment, would be a grave error. We must, as the House of Commons has for two decades, uphold independence for the arts free from political interference.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON].

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the appropriation for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities just as I supported the original legislation because I believe that when the history books are written on this 20th century, we are going to be judged not by how many screaming missiles or bombs we can produce. Bombs and missiles will determine, of course, whether we do survive—but we are going to be judged also on how we survived.

I think this will be dependent upon what type of scholars and what type of artists we are able to produce.

I had certain misgivings about this legislation and I certainly still have. They are the same as the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] mentioned—that it will tempt the Government to dictate to the arts.

There is some language in this report with which I disagree, and I want to disassociate myself from this language because I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. In my opinion, the



words represent a veiled threat to the arts. This language is on page 36 of the report and is as follows:

The committee would also caution that extreme care must be exercised that those responsible for the administration of this program do not unduly influence through the award of grants, the type or style of art which is to be cultivated in this country.

As the committee views this program, there are many potential pitfalls that must be avoided if it is to merit the continued support of the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I think the greatest pitfall in this program is the Government telling artists how they should produce and what they should produce.

Artists and scholars must be free. They must be daring and imaginative, and they must be unafraid. If they think a congressional committee is looking over their shoulders, rather than stimulating and encouraging and helping artists and scholars, we are going to be frustrating them and tying them down.

If the day ever comes when I feel that in order to get an appropriation, an artist must be pleasing to this Congress as far as his output is concerned, that is the day on which I will withdraw my support for this program because we do not want, in this country, the Government interfering with the arts. We ought to post a great big sign "Keep out," telling the politicians to stay out of the arts and the matter of awarding scholarships and leave such things to those who are best able to judge for themselves. We must not try to set ourselves up as censors.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is most appropriate that the distinguished and able gentleman from New Jersey has made these comments with reference to this proposed legislation. Of course, this is one of the reasons why the people have been fearful of bringing the Government into these programs, however necessary such aid might be.

Mr. Chairman, Congress in the years ahead, like the administrative agencies, must be careful not to attempt to influence the arts and the humanities and their developmental progress. I know of no legal restraint that we could impose to bind any Congress in the future. But the Congress is going to have to practice self-denial and not try to impose its judgment over and above the judgment of the authorities who have the responsibility for the disposition of these funds.

Once we ever start to interfere in the sense of trying to express our own likes and dislikes, it will simply mean that eventually, for the sake of freedom of the arts, Government assistance will have to be withdrawn.

Mr. JOELSON. I thank the gentleman. I would remind my colleagues that in the Soviet Union, judges have just sentenced two people to jail for daring to be critical. We do not want to be put in a position of denying appropriations for any similar reasons.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Dakota has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes, or so much of that time as he may desire to use, to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still amazed by the number of consultants hired by the Department of the Interior. I wonder if the gentleman from Indiana could tell me how many supergrades they have in that Department, or if he could even approximate the number of supergrades in the Department of the Interior?

Mr. DENTON. I cannot give you that information. I am sympathetic with your complaint about too many supergrades. In cases where the number of employees has been limited, they have contracted agency work. The work has not been as good a quality, and it has cost more.

Mr. GROSS. There is now before a subcommittee of which I am a member a request for some 500 additional supergrades, and I have no doubt that the Interior Department wants some of those. I cannot understand why the departments and agencies, with these highly paid employees cannot do their work in-house without hiring all these consultants.

Mr. DENTON. I could not agree with you more. We made that complaint in our report. The gentleman will find it on page 5. We will follow up on that. I agree with you.

Mr. GROSS. I trust the gentleman will do just that.

I should like to ask the gentleman about this language appearing on page 43 of the bill: "Archeological Research and Excavation." What are we spending \$2,300,000 to excavate?

Mr. DENTON. That work is mostly done in foreign countries through American universities. Reference to it appears in our hearings. It is something that has gone on for years. Some of it is in Egypt, and the Near East. The Government has done this for years.

Mr. GROSS. So we can add another \$2 million-plus to the arts and culture, or whatever you wish to call it.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to call it that.

Mr. GROSS. I just wanted to know where it was. It is over in Egypt.

Mr. DENTON. Part of it is in Egypt and part of it is in Guinea, India, Burma, Israel, and Tunisia, where there are ruins.

Mr. GROSS. It would not be possible for the Egyptians to take care of their own excavations, would it?

Mr. DENTON. I expect that they can take care of some of it. Other countries in the world are taking part in this excavation work, which is designed to increase the knowledge of the history of mankind.

Mr. GROSS. I want to ask about the Job Corps. Is there any money in this bill for the Job Corps?

Mr. DENTON. No, that comes under the poverty program. There are funds for supervisory work of the Job Corps which are transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Mr. GROSS. I wondered if there have been any more experiences similar to that on the Indian Reservation in Wisconsin, where a couple of girl employees of VISTA went to teach the frug and the Watusi. While teaching the Indians these dances, they were thrown off the reservation. Evidently the chiefs did not want the girls teaching the Indians how to dance. I don't know whether this is supposed to be art, culture, humanities, or what, but the Indians were dancing before this country was discovered. At any rate, they were thrown off the reservation, and the "Great White Father" in Washington had to send somebody to Wisconsin to get the girls back on the reservation and bury the hatchet.

Mr. DENTON. That is not funded under this appropriation. That is in the Economic Opportunity program. We will go into that when that bill is considered by the committee.

Mr. GROSS. You will do what, when?

Mr. DENTON. When the House considers the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill, I am sure my friend from Iowa will take it up at that time.

Mr. GROSS. Even though this bill provides for the Indian Bureau, which administers the reservation in Wisconsin where the trouble occurred. I still must go to the poverty program people to find out how and where the hatchet was used?

Mr. DENTON. They fund the program and they are responsible for its administration.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] such time as he may require.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, as we review the debate that we have had today, we will see that it has been pointed out that had any Member of the House written this bill himself, there would have been areas that he would have cut and areas in which he would have added. Certainly I find myself in that position. But I rise to recognize the work of the chairman of the subcommittee, my colleagues of the majority, the minority leader, the minority members, and the staff of this committee, for the fine job that they have done in an effort to reconcile the many areas concerned with our national needs.

For myself, I rise to point out that I support the bill. As has been mentioned, there are certain areas in the bill that some of us take exception to, and in other areas, some would have added funds.

In the subcommittee, and again in the full committee, there was a great concern for the considerations of financial responsibility which dictate that we reduce or postpone expenditures in order



to maintain maximum economic strength at a time at which our forces are engaged in an active war effort in Vietnam.

On the other hand, as the hearing testimony reflected, there are increasingly pressing needs here at home with respect to the management and maximum utilization of our national resources, for an expanding population, which demand urgent consideration.

Under the circumstances, I believe the committee struck a reasonable balance, with the assistance of its fine staff, and brought to the House a bill which, while it represents a substantial reduction of the budget total, makes a reasonable effort to carry forward programs which the American people have demonstrated they want their Representatives in Congress to advance, within the limits of the economic safety of the Nation.

(Mr. MARSH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENTON. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question with regard to the construction going on in Rock Creek Park and on the Memorial Bridge. This has been disgraceful. It has been going on for over a year. It is a hazard every night and every morning to motorists. I am wondering about what is being done about it.

Mr. DENTON. In the supplemental appropriation hearing that we had the other day, we went into that very thoroughly with the National Park Service. The chairman of the full committee wrote a letter to the National Park Service about this.

We have had continual difficulty with this and have taken it up with Park Service officials on numerous occasions. We intend to follow up on it.

Mr. CONTE. Is this a Job Corps operation? Are they learning how to build roads?

Mr. DENTON. This is a Park Service operation. It is an operation of the Park Service.

Mr. CONTE. The equipment out there seems to be rented equipment.

Mr. DENTON. That is right. They have quite a bit of equipment themselves, but they contract much of this work.

Mr. CONTE. I really think that the Pyramids in Egypt were built a lot faster than they are going to build the road through Rock Creek Park.

Mr. DENTON. I am sure you could not be far wrong in that.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman. Somewhere in this budget there is \$10,000 for the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts. I cannot find it. Is it in the bill?

Mr. DENTON. That is in the report under the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, on page 22.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, as one of those who sponsored the bill which created the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, I am very much interested in the section of the report and the appropriations relating to that area.

The spiritual needs of a civilized society must not be neglected while we provide the guns of warfare and the butter of nourishment. Today we should provide a full portion for the Nation's cultural life.

In the first place, I am concerned that there has been a reduction in the funds amounting to \$6,930,000 from the 1967 budget requests. This includes a \$1 million cutback for the endowment for the arts and the elimination of the entire \$5 million requested by the endowment for the humanities. I certainly hope there will not be a further reduction this afternoon. I think the National Endowment on the Arts is entitled to our support and to receive the full funding which the subcommittee has reported. I am sorry, indeed, that the National Foundation on the Humanities has not been funded, but I hope that the matter, when it is before the Senate will be remedied.

I am concerned about the matter referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] and by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. I think we must be very careful to insure complete freedom for the arts in this country. Congress should not attempt to exercise a role which would be tantamount to Government interference in the arts, something which has been decried time and time again. Perhaps there may be a temptation for those who review the appropriations to try to substitute their judgment for the judgment of those who are highly qualified and competent in a field of the arts. We are fortunate to have a distinguished Council on the Arts to advise in this area. I believe that we should leave questions of type or style of art to its discretion.

In addition to that point made in the report, the report also strongly recommends that awards should be made "to established foundations, organizations, and institutions, rather than to numerous individuals in the field of art." It implies that future funding will depend upon emphasizing grants to such established entities rather than to individuals and little known organizations which may be more inclined to engage in experimental and adventuresome programs.

Mr. Chairman, the amounts of money may be small, but the principles are weighty. One of the objectives we had when we passed the bill was to encourage the young artist, the new person entering the field of the arts. Every effort should be made to see that awards are made to creative individuals, although not recognized or established, and to newly orga-

nized groups, which will experiment and engage in venturesome programs. This in the long run will improve the cultural life of our society.

Again these decisions should rest with the Council on the Arts. Emphasizing grants to established institutions diverts the program from fresh creatives in newer fields and threatens to diminish the role of the Advisory Council.

I disagree with the rationale for not funding the Endowment for the Humanities because the program is not spelled out in detail. Testimony before the subcommittee pointed out that the distinguished Americans on the Council can be expected to develop programs in a dynamic way in response to events during the course of the year. Let us give them a vote of confidence.

Mr. Chairman, I will vigorously oppose any amendments to further reduce the appropriations, and I stress that freedom in the arts is essential for the full flowering of our creative life.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of the bill, I intend to offer an amendment which I think will be highly beneficial to this legislation. There are no controls on the expenditure of the many millions of dollars in the arts program provided by this Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, H.R. 14215, and I believe that Congress should require, as a condition of their expenditure, that they be equitably distributed among the several States.

Last year, I believe, we appropriated more than \$7 million for the National Endowment for the Arts and I do not find any breakdown of the amounts given to each State so far under this program. This information should be supplied us at this time, so we can actually see how much each State has received, as it is supplied by other Federal departments and agencies. On pages 297 and 298 of the published hearings on H.R. 14215, it is pointed out that the proposal by the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts is to give each State \$50,000 for a total of \$2.5 million, but this is only about one-third of the funds provided last year, and being requested this year, and it will probably take some time to parcel this out to the States on an equitable basis at the rate the National Endowment is proceeding.

Sections 5(h) and 11(c) of Public Law 89-209 authorizes the Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts to establish and carry out a program of grants-in-aid to assist the States with their art programs. The intent of the Congress in this section is clear, and my amendment would simply have clarified this and help in the administration of the program.

As we all know, many of our historic buildings and sites that are rich in tradition, history, and architecture and of great cultural and artistic value are threatened by the bulldozers and wrecking balls.

Already, some 6,000 of our heritage of 12,000 most historically significant buildings have been destroyed. Time does not



stand still, and progress of a kind which takes no account of history or cultural and artistic values is catching up with the landmarks which remain.

The Metropolitan Opera House is an outstanding and world-famous victim of this kind of short-sighted progress.

In December 1962 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall declared the Metropolitan Opera House eligible for registration as a national historic landmark, but the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., opposed such registration, and the board of directors, including Roger L. Stevens and Anthony A. Bliss, has continued to press for the destruction of the historic Metropolitan Opera House.

Mayor John Lindsay, of New York City, is interested in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, as are many other well-known people including Artur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern, Leonard Bernstein, Dr. Howard Hanson, Laszlo Halasz, Leopold Stokowski, Martha Graham, Rebekah Harkness, Dr. Harold Taylor, and Phillip Langer of the Theater Guild.

My proposed amendment would simply require that, as a condition of the expenditure of the millions of dollars provided, by this appropriation bill for the National Endowment for the Arts, none of these funds would be used directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City at 39th Street and Broadway. The Metropolitan Opera House should be preserved and can be operated on a sound basis for the enjoyment and appreciation of generations yet to come. The Met's friends are legion, and will yet save this exceptional structure known as a landmark throughout the world.

I append pertinent material for your consideration:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1966]

**MAYOR SUPPORTS SAVING OLD MET—AID SAYS LINDSAY SEEKS CONSTRUCTIVE PURPOSE FOR OPERA HOUSE—DEMOLITION SCHEDULED, BUT SEVERAL GROUPS HOPE THAT RAZING FOR OFFICES CAN BE PREVENTED**

(By Theodore Strongin)

Woody Klein, Mayor Lindsay's press secretary, said yesterday the mayor believed that the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street "should be saved and used for some constructive purpose. He has one or two staff members working on it," Mr. Klein added.

The opera house, which was completed in 1883, is scheduled to be demolished to make way for an office building after the opera company moves out next month. In September the new Met at Lincoln Center will open.

The mayor is pleased with the efforts of various groups who are trying to save the old building, said Mr. Klein.

Among these are the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit group with headquarters in Mount Vernon; the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, whose members will testify at a meeting of the city planning commission on March 30, and the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, which has asked the planning commission to institute condemnation proceedings so that the city acquires title to the Met property.

The architects' group believes that by easing certain zoning restrictions and granting special permits the builders of the planned office structure can be compensated for the

loss they would incur if the present auditorium is preserved.

These matters would have to be studied, the architects concede. So they will suggest at the planning commission meeting that an impartial feasibility study be made to investigate their suggestions and, maybe, find new ones.

Roy Anderson, head of the Save the Met Foundation, said that this organization was circulating petitions to be sent to Governor Rockefeller, asking him to "Introduce, support, and pass New York State legislation to preserve the famous Metropolitan Opera House." Mr. Anderson also said that he had information that could lead to a rehearing of the Met case before the Landmarks Preservation Commission or to a contest of the Met's lease to the group of real estate investors who plan to erect the office building.

#### TURNED DOWN LAST YEAR

In December the Landmarks Preservation Commission declined to designate the opera house a landmark, which would have saved it. At that time, the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects suggested preserving the auditorium and building the office building over it. The commission found the plan economically unfeasible.

#### TO TAKE POSSESSION MAY 8

The group that leased the old Met site is headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York. It will take possession on May 8. The Met expects to get an average of \$485,000 a year in rentals.

A provision in the lease forbids the use of the site for grand opera or musical presentations. Anthony Bliss, president of the Met, said that the limiting provision was made for financial reasons only, so that the new building would produce the greatest revenue possible for the Met.

He said that many feasibility studies had been made over the years, and that the Met itself had investigated the possibility of building over the present house, but that all plans had proved to be financially unsound.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE  
INTERIOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE,  
Washington, D.C., July 16, 1966.

MR. ROY ANDERSON,  
Trustee, Save the Met Foundation, Inc.,  
Mount Vernon, N.Y.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Secretary Udall has asked us to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of July 10 requesting that the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City be designated a registered national historic landmark.

In December 1962, the Secretary declared the opera house eligible for registration as a national historic landmark. Immediately following this, the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., was notified of the Secretary's action and invited to participate in the landmarks program. The association, however, declined to register the opera house because of its plans to demolish the structure. Since participation in the program is strictly voluntary, there is little more we can do.

We are in sympathy with your efforts to save the opera house and hope you will succeed in this endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

HOWARD P. STAYER,  
Assistant Director.

STATEMENT OF THE NEW YORK CHAPTER, THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS, BEFORE THE LANDMARKS PRESERVATION COMMISSION, SEPTEMBER 21, 1965, NEW YORK N.Y.

My name is Martin Cohen, architect, and I represent the New York chapter, the American Institute of Architects.

The architectural quality of a building must be judged not only by its formal design

in steel or concrete, but also by how well it fulfills the functions for which it was intended.

This auditorium is unique in the United States. There is no finer example here of the Louis XIV elegance characteristic of these classic 19th century opera houses. One must travel to Paris or Vienna or Milan to find a rival. But even more important, there is hardly a more satisfying interior theater space in the world. The hall has been criticized for technical stage limitations, and some seats are better located to produce revenue than to witness opera, but the fact remains that for the sheer drama of seeing, and being seen, in the exciting atmosphere of glittering spectacle, and for superb acoustics, this hall has few peers anywhere. One can hardly imagine a happier or more successful relationship between architecture and people. It must be preserved.

If the only way this great auditorium can be saved is to preserve the entire building, then the New York chapter would have to recommend the whole building be saved. However, we recognize the functional, as well as the architectural limitations, of the exterior building shell and would recommend that consideration be given to schemes in which the auditorium itself would be preserved, possibly with reconstruction of some essential spaces ancillary to the hall, within the framework of an income producing structure. We believe this theater can continue to serve New York's millions, while returning the site to revenue producing status for its owners.

It is difficult to avoid the analogy of Carnegie Hall. Also deemed redundant, technically inadequate, and slated for destruction but a few years ago, Carnegie Hall stands as an inspiration to those who believe in New York's readiness to preserve its architectural and musical heritages, and as a warning to those who would destroy our renowned halls of proven quality while chasing endlessly after elusive secrets to achieve adequate replacements.

We strongly urge the designation of this building as a landmark.

MARTIN H. COHEN, A.I.A.

[From New York Times, Mar. 25, 1966]

**FANS OF OLD MET PREPARED TO FIGHT—NEW BODY PETITIONS CITY AND PLANS TO RAISE MONEY**

Leonard Bernstein, Harold Clurman, Aaron Copland, Agnes de Mille, Gian Carlo Menotti, Tony Randall, Artur Rubinstein, George Szell, Jennie Tourel, and Peggy Wood are among the figures in the world of music and drama who have declared themselves in favor of saving the old Metropolitan Opera House from demolition.

They have joined the Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street. Leonard Altman is chairman of the group, which is now being formed.

The committee has petitioned the city planning commission to start proceedings to acquire the property by condemnation and put it up for auction. Members would raise the money needed for a successful bid and for renovation of the old house.

Bronson Binger, an architect who is the group's secretary, yesterday said some money has already been raised, but he would not disclose the amount.

There would be no cost to the city or to any other governmental body, Mr. Binger added.

#### MET NEEDS THE MONEY

The Metropolitan Opera will open in its new house in Lincoln Center in September. It has leased the old house to a group of real estate investors headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York. The Met expects to receive an average of \$485,000 annually from site rental over the next 25 years.



In a statement released today, the committee recognizes that the rental money or its equivalent is indispensable to the Met in its new home. The income the Metropolitan Opera Association will receive from "prudent investment of a fair purchase price—will far exceed the income which it will realize from the lease," the statement continues.

The statement cites the old Met as a symbol to the entire world of the highest artistic achievement, and adds that neither New York nor the United States can afford to lose it.

Other members of the committee to date are Stella Adler, Mrs. Douglas Auchincloss, W. H. Auden, S. L. M. Barlow, Thomas S. Buechner, Walter D. Binger, Robert Cordier, Kenward Elmslie, Barbara Epstein, Jason Epstein, Mrs. Mario Fratti, Robert Fryer, Hugh Hardy, Mrs. Gaston de Havenon, Mrs. Vladimir Horowitz, Mrs. Howell Howard, Charles E. Hughes, James Hulse, and Alan Price Jones.

Also, John Koch, Mrs. Jacob M. Kaplan, Miles Krueger, Lucy B. Lemann, Leo Lerman, Sylvia Marlowe, Joseph Papp, Will Petschek, Perry Rathbone, Henry Hope Reed, Mrs. Artur Rodzinski, Ned Rorem, Gertrude Rosenstein, Mrs. Remi Saunder, Mrs. Thomas Schippers, George Schneider, Daniel Selznick, Leo Silber, Mrs. Dario Soria, Mr. and Mrs. Lee Strasberg, and Sherman Sullivan.

In addition, Harold Taylor, John S. Thatcher, Mrs. Lawrence Copley Thaw, Virgil Thomson, Charles Turner, Mr. and Mrs. Michael Wager, David Wallace, Mr. and Mrs. Meyer Weisgal, and Herschel Williams.

Richard Caine Striker is secretary and Nathan L. Goldstein is general counsel.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 30, 1966]

#### DRIVE TO SAVE MET JOINED BY STOKOWSKI

(By Sally Hammond)

Leopold Stokowski has enlisted in the campaign to save the old Met.

One of the music world's towering figures, the dynamic, long-maned conductor added his name to the growing list being compiled by the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, whose headquarters is at 33 East 61st Street.

Leonard Altman, who heads the new committee, is a trustee of the Carnegie Hall Corp., and a veteran of the successful campaign that saved and renovated Carnegie Hall when it faced a similar fate as the Metropolitan Opera. He looks on his new job, he says, as "my second saving."

#### THE NEW MEMBERS

Along with Maestro Stokowski, Altman announced the following new adherents to the cause:

Martha Graham, Virgil Thomson, Henry Lee Munson, Leonard Rose, Rebekah Harkness, Raymond S. Rubinow, Mr. and Mrs. George Atkinson Braga, Mr. and Mrs. B. Rionda Braga and Marya Mannes.

Another leading maestro, Sixten Ehrling, conductor of the Detroit Symphony, recently called the committee from Detroit asking to be put on the list, Altman said.

Altman and his committee have been concentrating, however, on drawing up a report to be presented today at a hearing of the city planning commission where several plans for saving the old opera house will be considered.

"Everyone is waiting for our report," Altman said. "It is rather an exhaustive document which we think will lend weight to our belief and prove that the opera house is very definitely useful and can be self-sustaining."

#### TAX RECORDS CITED

Another organization devoted to the Met's rescue, the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., has charged that income tax records show the Metropolitan Opera Association has been operating at a profit and not at a deficit as

Met spokesmen have claimed in their case for demolishing the building.

Roy Anderson, editor of the magazine Choral and Organ Guide, who organized the foundation in 1961, has publicized his findings that Internal Revenue Service records here show that the Met declared surplus income of \$3,573,411 for the 3-year period ending with the 1963-64 season.

In reply, Anthony Bliss, president of the Met's board of directors, called Anderson's conclusions absolutely inaccurate.

"Mr. Anderson has confused as 'surplus,' funds that have been received for advance subscriptions and for special purposes," he said.

"For example, we received in 1964 funds for the new opera house, funds for productions for future years, subscriptions for the year 1965. None of these moneys can be truly counted as money received and available."

[From the New York World-Telegram & Sun, Feb. 12, 1966]

#### THE OLD MET MUST BE SAVED

(By Louis Biancolli)

While there is still time, and while the subject of landmarks is in the air, let me make one last, probably hopeless, appeal to save the Metropolitan Opera House.

No argument for the demolition of the old house, and I have heard and read all of them, can shake my conviction that this most significant of all the city's landmarks should not yield to the inroads of business.

At all costs, at whatever cost, this building must be saved. Let Mayor Lindsay, Governor Rockefeller, yes even President Johnson, step in and with their power of office safeguard this symbol.

For symbol it is, a symbol of spiritual growth. It is shameful that in all the practical and emotional commotion by good people over the preservation of this mansion and that public building, no meaningful official effort has yet been made to save the Met.

Don't get me wrong. I am thrilled over the magnificent new house at Lincoln Center, thrilled, too, at the prospect of several more years of the farsighted and daring leadership of Rudolf Bing.

I have no quarrel with institutions that like to better themselves. Like men of vision they must move on. But a house cannot move. It either remains where it is or it is torn down. But some houses are institutions too.

Such an institution is the Metropolitan. The house is of the city's very organic make-up. Removing it will leave a hole, a hole to be filled up by still one more office building. Every city in the world, large or small, has office buildings.

Only New York has a Metropolitan Opera House, a lodestone of artistic glamor for generations, a refuge for the millions hungering for great singing. After 8 decades of service the Met deserves better than to be destroyed like an old horse.

Other cities have their own opera houses, valued, cherished, preserved, even subsidized. None but New York has the Metropolitan. It belongs to the world. Among all opera houses this has a special sacredness. No other house has such memories to enshrine.

Berate its exterior for the aging warehouse that it seems. Enumerate the places in the house from which it is hard to see. Itemize the signs of physical deterioration. They amount to nothing beside the grandeur of its interior.

Our renovators, given the money and signal, could go in there and redo everything in one long summer. Given public and official interest, they could turn every office into a museum of opera. That part of the house could be a world center of mementoes.

The rest—so hospitable for singer and listener alike, so commodious, yet so friendly from seat to seat, row to row, aisle to aisle,

level to level, would remain New York's guest room for the great visiting ensembles.

I am convinced that, with unbiased effort, 40 weeks of ballet and opera, from outside or inside New York, could be booked into a preserved Metropolitan. If not profitably, at least deservedly, New Yorkers deserve that break.

[From the New York Post, Mar. 31, 1966]

#### THE OLD MET'S FRIENDS FIGHT ON TO SAVE IT

(By Sally Hammond)

With the clock ticking closer to midnight for the old Met, a host of its would-be rescuers were given a sympathetic hearing by the city planning commission.

Commissioner Ballard stretched a point yesterday to hear all the arguments that a "constructive purpose" could be found for the historic building, to use Mayor Lindsay's hopeful expression.

Ballard put the rather tense witnesses at ease, saying: "We of the commission would certainly applaud if you can figure out any way to do it." But he added that his commission could not settle the matter.

#### THIRD FORCE OPERA

Among the most effective speakers was Laszlo Halasz, the distinguished conductor who 20 years ago helped found the now flourishing New York City Opera and was its first general manager.

Just returned from conducting engagements in Europe, Halasz said he was "saddened" to find plans for the Met's demolition going ahead "in spite of all efforts."

Speaking as a practical artist, Halasz insisted that the old Met could be operated with very little money with a different approach. In a statement he brushed aside the theater's so-called shortcomings and suggested smaller scale productions, stylized staging, projected scenery, and the more effective use of modern lighting.

The city is ready for a third force opera, he said, with the new Met on one hand with its name stars and \$14 top and the New York City Opera on the other with its emphasis on the contemporary. The old Met could present standard opera and offer a livelihood for young American singers, 500 of whom are presently in voluntary exile in Europe.

#### HUROK IS QUOTED

Leonard Altman, who announced that Isaac Stern, the "savior of Carnegie Hall," had just joined his Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, submitted a 21-page statement ending with a quote by Sol Hurok: "Give me a 4,000-seat house and I'll keep it going 52 weeks a year." The committee claims that private funds are available to purchase and renovate the building and that it can be made self-sustaining.

Altman petitioned the commission to recommend to the mayor that he place the matter of preservation of this house before the proper civic authority so that proceedings leading to the city's taking title to the property at the earliest possible date can be instituted.

Martin H. Cohen, speaking for the American Institute of Architects, New York chapter, said: "To destroy the Met's auditorium would be tantamount to civic vandalism." And Mrs. Katherine Thayer Hobson, secretary of the Fine Arts Federation, said, "The amount of mail we have been getting is tremendous. If we do not save the Met we will be failing our duty to the whole country."

Roy Anderson, president of the Save the Met Foundation, charged again that the Metropolitan Opera Association was running a surplus and did not need to lease the site. Anthony Bliss, of the Met's board of directors, called his statement scurrilous. "Our books are open to all," he said.



[From the New York World-Telegram & The Sun, Feb. 9, 1966]

#### THE MET DOES WELL

In the "Closeup" column by Hope Johnson February 1, Mr. Bing is quoted as saying, "The Met will never make money, neither will any other opera not State subsidized."

The Save the Met Foundation would like to point out that, according to statements issued by the comptroller of the Metropolitan Opera Association, Mr. Bing had the following excesses after expenditures for 1961, 1962, and 1963:

1961-----	\$1,423,825
1962-----	1,812,080
1963-----	337,506

This amounts to \$3,573,411 balance in excess of expenditures during the past 3 years. The total income for the same 3 years was \$24,873,574.

Therefore, Mr. Bing appears to be doing quite well, even without a State subsidy. If any commercial, profitmaking corporation could make a 14.3 percent profit after taxes during a 3-year period it would hold up its head in pride.

In case your readers are interested we are continuing the fight to save the historic Metropolitan Opera House from demolition, and still have high hopes for success.

ROY ANDERSON,  
Save the Met Foundation.

#### COMPARISON

Comparison of contributions filed by Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., on 990-A filing for year ending June 30, 1964, with contributions claimed by other organizations on their 990-A filings for same period ending June 30, 1964:

Organization	Amount of gift claimed	Amount filed by Metropolitan Opera Association
Kathryn Long Trust-----	\$13,584.78	\$20,000
Metropolitan Opera Endowment Trust-----	7,889.45	1,964
Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts-----	75,520.61	(1)
Cornelius M. Bliss Memorial Fund-----	4,300.00	2,600
Metropolitan Opera Guild, Inc.-----	261,000.00	276,100
James Foundation-----	100,000.00	50,000
Oaklawn Foundation-----	500.00	500
Cecil Blaffner Hudson Foundation-----	(2)	5,500
Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation-----	25,000.00	25,400
Gramma Fisher Foundation-----	(3)	71,000
Preservation Society for Newport County-----	(4)	5,000
Youths' Friend Association-----	(5)	1,000
Ford Foundation-----	600,000.00	(6)
Do-----	25,000.00	25,000

<sup>1</sup> None.

<sup>2</sup> No filing of 990-A.

In that certain of the organizations contributing to the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., have not filed 990-A forms, the above schedule is incomplete. However, there appears to be at least eight organizations whose 990-A filings contain a different amount than shown on the 990-A filing submitted by the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1966]

PLAN WOULD KEEP MET WITH NEW BUILDING OVER IT—ARCHITECT WANTS CITY BOARD TO DEFER DECISION ON A REPLACEMENT

(By Theodore Strongin)

A full exploration into ways of saving the auditorium of the present Metropolitan Opera House, by building over it rather than demolishing it, was suggested yesterday to the city planning commission.

The proposal was made by Martin Cohen, representing the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, at a commission meeting in city hall, Mr. Cohen asked the commission to delay action for 3 months on an application for a special zoning permit, submitted by the builders of a 40-story office building planned for the site when the Met moves out on May 10. The delay would allow time for the study to be made.

The Met will open its next season in September in its new house in Lincoln Center. The opera company has leased its old site for 50 years to Keystone Associates, a group of real estate developers, who plan to demolish the old house and erect the new building after the Met moves out on May 10.

The delay was opposed by Samuel Kramer, attorney for Keystone Associates. He said it would be unfair to ask Keystone to wait longer before starting the project, in view of the valuable time, effort and money already spent in engineering and architectural studies.

Mr. Cohen suggested a number of ways in which the developers could be recompensed for the loss of money-earning floor space and for added construction costs should they decide to include the auditorium in their new building. The city could allow them to build higher, and it could waive the requirement by which buildings must be terraced back from the street at certain heights.

Besides the architects' chapter, several other groups as well as individuals made strong pleas for saving the Met. William F. R. Ballard, chairman of the commission, ruled these out of order, saying that they did not bear on the business at hand, which was specifically the special zoning permit application. For the most part Commissioner Ballard let the pleas be heard anyway.

Among those testifying were members of the Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, who proposed that the city acquire the building at no cost to itself, and let the committee renovate and run it as a hall for music and dance. The committee would raise the needed money.

Roy Anderson, speaking for the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., declared that the Met's lease to Keystone was invalid, and that so were many of the Met's financial statements, which it used as evidence in getting permission from the courts to make the lease.

Several others testified mostly for saving the Met but one was against.

[From the New York Post, Apr. 3, 1966]

#### SAVE THE MET FOR SHAKESPEARE

Shakespeare in the old Metropolitan Opera House?

Phillip Langer, speaking for the Theater Guild, would very much like to see the historic Met with its capacious stage saved from demolition for just that purpose.

In a letter to City Planning Commissioner Ballard, Langer wrote:

"We urge and entreat you to make every effort to preserve the Metropolitan Opera House. There are not enough large auditoriums in New York City to handle the large number of Shakespearean and other classical spectacles that would like to come here."

#### ISAAC STERN AGREES

Citing the same need, Isaac Stern, the violinist whose efforts helped save Carnegie Hall, wired the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera to say, in part:

"Theaters of this large size and with (the Met's) purposefulness are much too rare and can be of enormous value to the artistic expansion of the city of New York."

"I feel that this hall could operate 40 weeks a year with absolutely no detriment

or competition whatsoever to the new auditoriums now being completed."

In the Theater Guild's plea to Commissioner Ballard, Langer wrote that several times in recent years the Guild has tried to engage the Met for a season of Shakespeare. But the hall was never available, except in May, a notably poor time for legitimate presentations.

#### NO PLACE TO PLAY

Also, efforts to bring productions to the New York City center found that, too, unavailable and the productions were thus unable to come to New York.

"If the Metropolitan Opera House were to be saved," Langer summed up, "we feel it is evident with a large number of opera, ballet, and theatrical producers in the city that the Metropolitan Opera House could be filled throughout the season with exciting productions that otherwise cannot come here, and have not come here through the years."

STATEMENT OF LASZLO HALASZ IN FAVOR OF SAVING THE METROPOLITAN AUDITORIUM, TO NEW YORK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, MARCH 30, 1966

The Metropolitan Opera House should be saved. Its historic and esthetic values should be assessed by experts in the field.

I shall limit myself to the question of the constructive purpose for which it should be preserved, a point raised by Mayor Lindsay in his endorsement of rescuing the Metropolitan from destruction.

The Met is the only theater in Greater New York which could serve as a true Stadttheater, or municipal theater, and, because of its central location and large seating capacity, which could be managed economically as well. If this auditorium were destroyed, decades might pass before another theater of its capacities could be constructed, and at a frightful cost.

The so-called shortcomings of the theater do not really furnish arguments against the preservation of the opera house. Although 600 seats allegedly have obstructed views, this does not seem to prevent their being sold for almost every performance. And if scenery and staging were designed to occupy a more central portion of the stage, the angles of visibility (even from obstructed-view seats) would be improved considerably. Moreover, the 600 seats could be used by the blind, increasing their so-limited opportunities to attend live performances. Similarly, the so-called inadequacy of backstage storage space for scenery, props, etc., is also closely connected with the requirements of large-scale productions, which emphasize the grand rather than the opera. With a different approach to production problems, drawbacks could be overcome by stylized staging, projected scenery, and the more effective use of modern lighting. (The crucial and ever-present question of costs might also be resolved by this kind of reassessment of the basic philosophy of operatic production.) Although I concede that office space is very cramped, the dedicated Met staff has functioned well within these limitations. A different operation resulting in the reduction of personnel occupying the theater could provide more elbow room. Lastly, the present lack of air-conditioning in the house is the problem most easily dealt with. Since New York is a summer festival, as we are continually reading, an air-conditioned Metropolitan would draw large audiences and quickly amortize the initial cost of the installation of equipment, incidentally adding immeasurably to the meager local summer theater facilities.

The following theater arts should comprise the saved Metropolitan-City Theater:

#### OPERA

Greater New York City is ready for a third force in opera. The Metropolitan is more and



more becoming an organization which concentrates on the presentation of name stars in performances available to the few who can obtain tickets and afford to spend up to \$14.00 apiece for them; the City Opera Co. focuses on American, contemporary, and the lesser known operatic works. The standard operas, however, which still appeal most to the operagoers of the world, including those of Greater New York City, with its large ethnic groups, offer the best chance of liveliness for the young American singers, 500 of whom are presently in voluntary exile in Europe. This standard repertoire is simply not available to the masses of New York during the main seasons.

Therefore, I visualize another opera company in addition to the Metropolitan and the City Opera, one leaning heavily on the established repertoire and devoted to presenting higher quality performances in new scenic productions by thoroughly rehearsed ensembles featuring the cream of American singers and creative artists, those in the United States and others who should be repatriated. The main consideration in the attainment of this goal is finding a suitable theater which could be used not only on the days and evenings of the performances, but also for the essential and sometimes extensive preparatory work and rehearsals.

#### CLASSICAL OPERETTA

The people of New York's melting-pot crave the operettas of their various national heritages. The "Viennese Operetta" from von Suppe to Lehar draws sold-out houses wherever and whenever it is performed. The French Can-canese masterpieces a la Offenbach are not heard at all, and our steadily mounting Spanish speaking population is entitled to hear and enjoy the numerous Zarzuelas which are completely neglected in our city. A company concentrating on these musicals could fill a large part of the available season of the saved Met, and with stunning financial results.

#### BALLET

New York is the ballet city of the world, but outside of the New York City Ballet, no company has a home. Martha Graham's company, the Ballet Theater, the Joffre Ballet, Jose Limon's Troupe, etc., must perform in theaters and at times not of their own choosing, but to suit what is available. These companies, together with the visiting foreign ballets (Hurok attractions), could represent another large portion of the booking of the newly formed Stadt Theater.

#### DRAMA

There are historical plays which we do not see and hear in New York because they require mammoth stages, large casts, and commensurate seating capacities in order to equalize the cost. Robert Whitehead and Elia Kazan, both of whom have been in favor of saving the Met, could formulate plans for such a division.

To summarize, the growing population of greater New York and the cultural expansionism so evident these days require a theater which could house all of these art forms under one roof. The present Metropolitan Opera House is the only theater which can make such a project possible. Our city, our country, and our people are crying for it. With the dynamiting of the Met such a project would be demolished before it could even be discussed. Selfish interests or fear of competition (and healthy competition is after all one of the keystones of our national life) should not be permitted to interfere with progress.

[From the New York World-Telegram & the Sun, Feb. 23, 1966]

#### DON'T DESTROY THE MET

As a lover of opera, a Metropolitan subscriber, and as an architect, I cannot help but contemplate with dismay the impending destruction of the present Metropolitan Opera House.

The old house has its faults but they are not acoustic, and experience with the two completed music theaters at Lincoln Center should cause the Opera Association's directors much concern. The City Opera Company's move to the New York State Theater (which will establish it as the first major company unable to sing unassisted in its own home) is but another compelling reason to save the old Met—not as an archeological artifact but as a vital and essential component of New York's life.

HERBERT KAUFMAN.

[From the New York World-Telegram & the Sun, Mar. 26, 1966]

#### THE MET'S DESTRUCTION

One of the saddest aspects of the impending destruction of the hallowed Metropolitan Opera House is the ghoulish abandon with which gala performances are scheduled to celebrate the dismal deed.

But possibly even more cynical is the public hearing of the city planning commission scheduled for March 30 at city hall, at which will be considered the granting of special exceptions to the zoning laws modifying height and setback regulations for the opera house site. Thus the developers of the proposed office building request the public's permission to make a more intensive use of this crowded site—use which the zoning resolution enacted only a few years ago was expressly designed to prevent.

Not only is the community to be bereft of this noble portion of its history and heritage, but the community's laws are to be legally violated so that the bereavement may be profitable.

HERBERT KAUFMAN.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, Mar. 14, 1966]

#### "BARBARIANS" THREATEN THE MET

A few days ago it was announced that the great golden curtain of the Metropolitan Opera House will be cut in scraps by RCA and sold as souvenirs with long-play records.

Here is another example of cultural vulgarity in keeping with the whole idea of demolishing the Met. Governor Rockefeller states that the Met (built in 1883) is antiquated and inadequate and that the real estate is far too valuable to permit the continued existence of this venerable building.

The Paris Opera House was constructed in 1864-74. Though it has an imposing exterior and marble foyers, the auditorium is ugly and insignificant. That the Paris Opera House is antiquated and inadequate cannot be doubted. Located in the center of Paris, it occupies a piece of real estate that is unquestionably one of the most valuable in the entire world.

But would the French dream of demolishing it to erect office buildings that would yield a fantastic revenue? Never. Instead they recently commissioned Marc Chagall, one of the world's greatest living artists, to paint the ceiling. The French possess cultural values that transcend francs and centimes. These values we have not yet acquired.

The demolition of the Metropolitan Opera House with its incomparably beautiful auditorium and acoustics constitutes an act of vandalism and those who sanction this sacrilege enhance our reputation as cultural barbarians.

LUCY B. LEMANN.

THE HOME OF THE DIAMOND HORSESHOE—AN ANALYSIS

(By William H. Edgerton<sup>1</sup>)

(Architecture is the printing press of all ages, and gives a history of the society in which it was erected.—LADY MORGAN)

On the 15th day of May 1880, a certificate of incorporation was recorded in the office of the secretary of state of New York. The corporation designated in this certificate was the Metropolitan Opera House Co. of New York, Ltd. As reported in Harper's New Monthly magazine of November 1883:

"In what other cause of charity would it have been found so brief and easy a manner to induce 70 men of business to subscribe \$20,000 each, in order to raise the \$1,400,000 which the Metropolitan Opera House was estimated to cost? Here there was not only the certainty of no pecuniary return, but the additional prospect to the stockholders of paying their admission into their own building like the undistinguished throng. One of them has computed that it will cost him \$20 to lend his box for an evening. When we compare this alacrity with the struggles of the Metropolitan Museum of Art, it shows that whatever may be the nature of the hold of Italian opera upon the high-dizened, select populace, it is at least very powerful."

Apparently the number of boxes in their existing opera house, The Academy of Music, were in short supply. In fact, the demand became so great for these boxes that they "quite lost their character of unprofitable investments. Just before the project of the new opera house was undertaken, \$30,000 was offered for one of them."

An abortive attempt to locate the new opera house on a 200- by 200-foot plot near Grand Central Station was made by the committee only to discover after accepting the design of architect J. Cleveland Cady that adjoining property owners held a guarantee restricting the proposed site to uses other than those of public amusement, and that unanimous waiver of this restriction could not be obtained, even in the case of Italian opera. Thus thwarted, the committee made a more enviable decision when they chose the current location, a truncated rectangle of land bounded by Broadway, 40th Street, 7th Avenue, and 39th Street, in an area now referred to as Manhattan's garment district. This site allowed 60 additional feet in depth, and allowed the architect to realize the full potential of his designs.

In their 19th century prose alternating between awe and gentle criticism, Harper's New Monthly magazine justifies the design of the new opera house thusly:

"The design of an opera house is at every point a compromise between conflicting claims. Fortunately, there was no question between the two great divisions of the house, the stage and the auditorium. The auditorium is quite the largest in the world, exceeding its closest rivals, San Carlos at Naples, and La Scala at Milan, by some feet

<sup>1</sup> William H. Edgerton is editor of the Dow Building Cost Calculator published by F. W. Dodge Co., a division of McGraw-Hill Inc. He is the author of the "Building Costs & Trends" section of the Appraisal Journal.



in every dimension. The stage is exceeded in area only by two, that of the Imperial Opera in St. Petersburg and that of the New Opera in Paris. But it is evident from the plan that the dependencies of the auditorium have been in some degree sacrificed to the auditorium itself. This sacrifice is not of the stairways, by any means, but simply of the corridors, which are in some places narrowed beyond what an architect would probably think desirable for the free circulation of an audience between the acts. The number of occupants in each tier of the boxes is so small, 222 being the maximum, and only the male half of these being liable to engagements between the acts, that the narrowing of the corridors does not threaten any physical inconvenience, but only some impairment of the character of dignity and spaciousness which it is desirable to give to the corridors. "The entrances and exits, indeed, are entirely ample, almost beyond example elsewhere. It has often been pointed out how far inferior modern public buildings are in means of access and departure to those of the Romans. It would not occur to anybody to call the doorways of a modern building vomitoria, even if modern notions of verbal propriety did not restrain him. Here, however, with the rare good fortune in New York of a building standing free on all four sides, it was comparatively easy to contrive ample and separate entrances to all parts of the house, at no greater inconvenience than that of an increase in the number of ticket takers. The great double staircase, which is gained from the Broadway entrance, through a vestibule 63 by 37, in two flights, each of 12 feet in width, gives access to all parts of the house except the gallery. There are also large vestibules midway down each side, that on 39th Street 70 by 33, that on 40th Street 50 by 33. To each of these entrances carriages may drive under cover of a permanent veranda of metal, and from each a winding staircase, contrived in the space between the curve of the amphitheater and the rectangle in which it is inscribed, gives access to the boxes; while from each of these side entrances a staircase rises to the balcony, and two to the gallery.

"The interior form of an opera house is distinctly established by experience as the amphitheatrical, and very few innovations upon this typical form are possible. The amphitheater in this case seems elongated beyond what is usual, and then widens at the stage end so as to give it more nearly the form of a lyre than of the glittering horseshoe's ample round, which belongs to the conventional temple of the lyric drama. There is a more important departure from the conventional opera house for the proscenium is altogether omitted. In the 14th Street Academy the proscenium boxes have been objects of desire, to achieve which there have been given whole seasons of intrigue and social politics. Inasmuch as the proscenium could not be extended so as to include the amphitheater, a widely played opening of a very few feet in depth, decorated with large pilasters at the reentrant angle, and still for convenience called the proscenium, is the only representative of the abolished feature.

"The purpose of making any box as desirable as any other box has by no means been attained, however, when the proscenium has been abolished; and the study of sight lines and acoustics, so as in some measure to bring this about, is one of the chief of the many problems which beset the architect of an opera house. In the present case, sight lines were drawn from every part of the house in each tier to the sides and the rear of the stage, to ascertain how much of the view of the stage would be lost from that point, and the contour of the auditorium and the pitch of each tier were modified in conformity with the results of these studies to the arrange-

ment actually adopted. The result has been so satisfactory that it is safe to say that there is no theater in which there are fewer bad seats in proportion to its size, nor any opera house in which the difference between the best and the worst boxes is so small.

"The seating capacity of the house seems arranged with a liberality almost extravagant. The total number of seats is 3,045, divided as follows: parquette, 600; baignoir, 72; parterre, 216; first tier, 222; second tier, 222; balcony, 735; gallery, 978. And yet the New Opera in Paris, which occupies nearly if not quite as great an area, has only 2,156 seats.

"The facilities for emptying the opera-house, while they are beyond those of almost any other theater, are less needed than in almost any other theater. Their amplitude is a matter of inconvenience, not a matter of safety. The destiny of a theater almost proverbially is to die by fire, and there is scarcely a famous theater in the world which has not been rebuilt more than once. Here it has been attempted to construct not merely a slow-burning but a really fireproof theater.

"The only combustible material it contains, outside of the stage, is the wood used in the floors and their furrings, and in the fittings of the galleries. The stairways throughout are of iron in brick wells; the partitions, apart from the main walls of brick, are of fireproof material, the construction of the floors of fireproof arches turned between iron beams, the flooring of the corridors of tiles.

"The ceiling is a great sheet of metal hung from metal bars, and its dome a great saucer of the same material hung from the roof. The roof rests upon the elliptical walls of the auditorium, which are the main constructional walls of the building, and the roof construction is of iron trusses. The supports of the gallery are iron beams anchored in the walls of the auditorium. Many difficulties arose in applying this construction to the ever-varying lines and forms required in an opera house, and many interesting expedients were adopted to overcome them. In order to gain an easy descent from the corridors to the front of the boxes, for example, it was found necessary to interpolate two steps, and this necessitated a double bending of the rolled beams which were to carry the galleries. Moreover, as both the pitch and the slope were continually changing, no beams would require exactly the same bending, except the pairs opposite each other in the same tier. The contractor found it necessary to erect a mill of his own in which the beams could be bent as well as rolled. The proscenium wall is continued 25 feet above the auditorium, and required to be supported from the walls on either side of the curtain opening. A brick arch was not practicable from lack of abutment. The expedient adopted was a truss some 80 feet in length by 15 in depth, upon which the gable wall of the stage stands, and to which it is additionally secured by rods built in the brickwork. A smaller truss spans the curtain opening.

"The stage is required to be an open space from top to bottom and from side to side. The end wall of the building thus becomes an isolated piece of brickwork, unstiffened by floors, 125 feet high from the street, and 106 feet wide. It is an unbroken surface within, but on the outside is reinforced by two massive buttresses 5 feet deep. The roofing of the stage is also an interesting piece of construction, for it is not often that a roof of 106 feet clear span is required to be set upon walls 101 feet high. This is effected here by an iron truss, set upon rollers to provide for the expansion and contraction of the metal throughout so great a span.

"As the stage is the point of any theater especially vulnerable to fire, it is of prime importance to confine to the stage any fire that

may originate there. This is accomplished not only by making the rest of the house incombustible, but by converting the stage itself into a flue, inclosed in the brick walls which rise above the rest of the house. A large skylight in the roof of the stage is weighted so as to fall open when its fastenings are removed, and these fastenings are arranged to give way at a comparatively low temperature, and thus open the top of the chimney of which the walls are the sides and the proscenium opening the hearth. To put out fires which may arise on the stage, reliance is placed, beyond the ordinary precautions, upon a novel automatic appliance. A network of small pipes is hung above the stage, filled with water from a tank in the roof, and pierced at frequent intervals with holes stopped with soft solder, which melts readily, and drenches the stages as from a great shower bath.

"Among the novelties the arrangement of the orchestra deserves mention. It is placed in a brick bowl sunk below the parquet, and floored at a level which will leave the musicians visible only from the upper tiers. The sonority of this reservoir is expected materially to reinforce the volume of tone.

"Another novelty is the system of supporting the stage. The supports of the stage must be readily removable, so that any point underneath may be utilized as it may be called for by the varying exigencies of the drama. Ordinarily this requirement is fulfilled by the use of a wilderness of timber supports, any section of which may be knocked away as the space it occupies is needed. This arrangement is hardly compatible with a fireproof building. Here a light iron construction has been devised, containing some 4,000 members, which has all the facility of removal and reconstruction of the carpentry. The cellar of the stage is 30 feet deep from the floor, and this depth is divided into three stories, of which any one, or any section of all three, can be made available at once.

"The exterior of the building is considerably less like the stereotyped treatment of an opera house than the interior. Costly as the building is, it is so very large as to limit the expenditure upon its external architecture. And this limitation seems to have determined the architect, together with other considerations, to seek for the effect of the great building through simplicity and expressiveness of general composition, and the utmost delicacy of such decorative detail as he must somewhat sparingly employ. The style, in deference, possibly, to the purpose of the building, is Italian, and in the Broadway entrance, which is more copiously decorated than any other part, is a correct and academic Italian Renaissance. This style has more elegance than vigor."

And today, more than 82 years later, this elegance—though much in need of a good cleaning—is a welcome relief from the monolithic verticality of New York's more recent architectural mediocrity.

#### COST OF AN OPERA HOUSE

The cost of a building is always of prime interest. The figures shown in table I were reported in *American Architect and Building News* of February 28, 1884.

The cost of the building, exclusive of land and items of personal property not reported in the above list, was \$1,024,061.15. According to historical cost information maintained by the Dow Building Cost Calculator, today's replacement of the building would cost the princely sum of \$45 million.

The first owners of the opera house were 70 men of business who each subscribed \$20,000 to raise the then estimated \$1,400,000 cost of the building and its real estate. These 70 men united themselves into the original Metropolitan Opera House Co. of New York, Ltd. Originally there were 74 opera boxes—70 for the stockholder families and 4 to be disposed of by the manager.



Democracy of ownership was so strong that the heads of these families drew lots to achieve impartial allocation of the boxes. Then, on September 21, 1883, the Metropolitan Improvement Co., Ltd., was formed and held its first meeting. Ownership of this corporation was identical to the Opera House Co.; the Improvement Co. was formed "to purchase, lease, own, hold, and sell real estate, improving the same by the erection of buildings, do the management, and conduct of such buildings for the purpose of a hotel or apartments, with restaurants and other facilities connected therewith."

TABLE I.—Original construction costs

Amount paid for real estate--	\$622,191.44
Excavation-----	54,002.44
Masonry, plastering, tiling----	401,664.59
Iron-work-----	272,539.70
Carpentering-----	80,271.61
Roofing-----	11,382.00
Plumbing-----	15,050.65
Gas-fitting and fixtures-----	21,694.62
Terra-cotta-----	16,510.00
Electric wiring-----	5,172.38
Stage, rigging, loft-----	28,343.84
Seating-----	23,044.75
Ventilating and heating-----	35,344.31
Decorating-----	14,349.68
Architects' fees-----	44,690.58
Total-----	1,646,252.59

When translated into action, this resulted in the construction of 70 bachelor apartments in twin towers flanking the entrance of the building. Ownership was divided equally among the 70 families: freehold of premises on the opera boxes and bachelor apartments above.

Opening in the fall of 1883 with Gounod's "Faust," the opera house immediately became an international symbol of the cultural excellence of New York City. However, even in those early days there was an indication of the hassle of real estate and financial affairs to come.

## ENTER: MISFORTUNE

The first disaster was of major import; on August 27, 1892, fire came to the opera. If a sleepy patron had been in his seat, it might have seemed to him that the closing scene of Mozart's "Don Giovanni" was suddenly and forcefully coming true. A fortnight later, the American Architect and Building News carried the following story in their issue of September 10:

"The detailed accounts of the fire show that a most extraordinary use was being made of the building at the time. Apparently, a sort of scene-painters' festival had been going on there for some time. Not only was the scenery belonging to the opera house piled about in all directions, but new scenery for two other theaters, Hoyt's and the Casino, was being painted on the stage; and immense numbers of huge, freshly painted canvases were stacked in the files and in the wings, while others were in process of preparation on the stage floor, as rapidly as the decorators and carpenters of the other two theaters, with the help of a part of the opera house staff, could paint them and put them together.

"To make this enormous accumulation of dangerous material as dangerous as possible to the building, the iron curtain between the stage and the auditorium was pulled up to its full height, so as to expose the whole interior to fire from the stage; and this notwithstanding that, by a piece of inexcusable carelessness, a temporary wooden floor, which was built over the whole area of the auditorium, on the occasion of a ball held in the building last spring, had been left in place.

"In some unexplained way, very likely by the lighting of a pipe among the easy-going individuals in charge of the place, the fire caught among the paintpots and varnish,

and spread like a flash over the fresh, oily canvases and pine wood stretchers which were stocked or piled in enormous masses on all sides, as well as overhead. As might have been expected, it did not occur to any of these vigilant guardians of the great property to lower the iron proscenium-curtain, but all hands fled, every one escaping without injury from what must have been a blaze so sudden and violent as to have been little short of an explosion, with the exception of a boy, who had been sent on an errand to the fourth story, and, terrified by the sudden burst of flames, jumped down a shaft to the first story, and was taken out with a fractured skull.

"Meanwhile, the different portions of the construction behaved just as they were intended to do. The great skylight over the stage was shattered immediately by the heat, giving bent to the flames, and, by its powerful draft, holding them away from the auditorium. If the iron curtain had been down, it is not likely that the least damage would have been done by fire to the auditorium; but, with the proscenium-arch open, in a room 90 feet deep, 100 wide, and 150 high, filled with blazing oil and canvas and pine wood, it was hardly possible that the heat should not have had some effect; and the temporary floor took fire, smoking and staining the ceiling, while the balcony railings were partly destroyed, and the ceiling itself, which is of metal suspended from the iron roof, was somewhat injured.

"At this moment the firemen came in, and wrought, with streams of water from 25 engines, the havoc which seems to be unavoidable in such cases, soaking the walls, floors, and upholstery, with what remained of the scenery, and even the books in the manager's library, and the dresses in the wardrobes. It did not take many minutes of this sort of work to complete the destruction of \$200,000 worth of property, consisting mostly of scenery and dresses; the building, with the exception of the stage roof and fittings, and the decorations of the auditorium, being little injured. No doubt, the skill of the New York firemen had a good deal to do with keeping the loss within such reasonable bounds; but it is certainly highly creditable to the architect that his building should have resisted so well the fury of such a conflagration."

In the beginning, the Opera House Co. had given a mortgage for \$600,000 to the Bowery Savings Bank, and when the Improvement Co. was formed to build the bachelor apartments, a mortgage of \$210,000 was given to one of its directors, Adrian Iselin. To reconstruct the building after the fire, together with his desire to clear title to the property and to consolidate the mortgages, Iselin forced a sheriff's sale. A new company was formed in March 1893, to purchase the assets of the two original companies at the sheriff's sale on March 22, 1893. Its name was the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co.; its capital stock consisted of \$1,050,000, being 10,500 shares each with a value of \$100; and its directors included notable men of great wealth such as J. P. Morgan, William K. Vanderbilt, and William C. Whitney. Land conveyance to the new company was by referee's deed, and reconstruction of the building was commenced.

This reconstruction produced a slightly different interior arrangement; since the new corporation was formed by 35 of the original 70 owner-families, only 35 boxes were reconstructed, with title again termed freehold of premises. The new company leased the auditorium to various outside production companies for operatic productions, thus relieving the 35 owners from further financial obligation in case the productions operated at a loss. To insure absolute control over the affairs of the corporation, in their request for corporate status the

directors of the real estate company included the following statement: "No transfer of stock shall be made except to a person or persons previously approved by the directors."

Then, in October 1889, when some operatic patrons wished to formalize the emerging social activities in connection with the production of opera, the Metropolitan Opera Club was formed as a membership corporation for the cultivation of vocal and instrumental music, the encouragement and support of operatic and musical performances, and the promotion of social intercourse among its members. The Opera Club has functioned throughout the years, though it now is no longer a corporate entity. There are several unanswered questions regarding a possible interest in the opera real estate held by the Metropolitan Opera Club that will be developed below.

The year 1903 saw the formation of still another company, the Conried Metropolitan Opera Co., organized solely for purposes of operatic production. Its name was changed in 1908 to the Metropolitan Opera Co., with an assent to the name change given by the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co. The latter then entered into a lease with the former, for the production of opera in the building. The original lease was due to terminate May 31, 1911, but contained self-renewing 5-year options.

In 1932, the owner-families organized what is now known as the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., a membership corporation, and began production of opera in the opera house, replacing outside production companies. No doubt, one of the replaced companies was the Metropolitan Opera Co. whose lease was allowed to expire. With the advent of national radio networks, several years previously, it became quite apparent that opera productions were becoming a subject of great public support and interest and that operatic productions might well be placed on a paying basis. Thus the owner-families returned to direct operation of the auditorium.

By this time the freehold family ownership was being held, in several instances, by the heirs of the original families. Further, many of these heirs did not like opera and, in order to add to personal income, began to rent or lease their freehold to individuals who were more interested.

Because of the confusion brought about by the actions of the box owners, it was decided that the owner-family controlled Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., would buy the now-famous building from the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co. (also under the same owner-family control), but the former claimed that it was without sufficient funds to effect the purchase.

Therefore, beginning in 1938, the Real Estate Co. began threatening its sister company, the Opera Association—both controlled by the same family-owners—that it would sell or demolish the building unless funds would be found for a purchase, thereby forestalling demolition. The Opera Association made a wide and dramatic public appeal for funds on their weekly radio programs "to help save this historic building." By 1940 the Opera Association had realized more than \$1 million in gifts for the purpose of buying the opera house, and an announcement was made that "the public has saved the opera house."

It would appear that the association then paid its self-controlled Real Estate Co. \$1,970,000 and acquired title to the opera house subject to a demand mortgage of \$470,000 (which still stands today) with the Morgan Guarantee Trust Co., as well as acquiring a warehouse used for the storage of scenery, located at 209 West 40th Street, New York. Immediately upon acquisition of the building the association gave a "purchase money"



mortgage in the amount of \$1 million to the Title Guarantee & Trust Co. This mortgage was, and is represented by 4-percent bonds \$467,000 of which have been redeemed. At this point the Metropolitan Opera Co., the old production company, was dissolved, followed a few days later by the dissolution of the Metropolitan Opera & Real Estate Co.

#### NOW, TO THE PRESENT

On February 27, 1961, the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., petitioned the New York Supreme Court, under the provisions of the membership corporations law of New York State, as follows:

"Your petitioner desires to lease the said Metropolitan Opera House site for the purpose of demolishing the present improvements thereon and replacing the same with a modern building for office and other commercial purposes, and has entered into an agreement of lease, dated February 16, 1961, for the lease of the same to Jack D. Weiler and Robert H. Arnow, as tenants, for an initial term of 50 years, with two renewal terms of 25 years each, at a net fixed annual rental during the 50-year term, as follows:

"During the first 4 years: \$200,000 per annum.

"During the next 6 years: \$400,000 per annum.

"During the second 10 years: \$450,000 per annum.

"During the third 10 years: \$500,000 per annum.

"During the fourth 10 years: \$550,000 per annum.

"During the fifth 10 years: \$600,000 per annum.

"The net fixed annual rental during the renewal terms will be a sum equal to 6 percent of the fair market value of the land as of the commencement of such respective terms, but in no event less than \$500,000 per annum."

Among the several reasons given in the petition as to how the interests of the petitioner would be promoted by the lease, were the following:

"The board of directors of your petitioner has heretofore approved the participation of your petitioner in the Lincoln Center project which involves the creation of a unique cultural center in the city of New York to house a complex of constituent institutions each serving an important area of interest in the broad field of the performing arts. A principal feature of the Lincoln Center project is the construction of a new Metropolitan Opera House for use by your petitioner. It is anticipated that the new Metropolitan Opera House will be ready for occupancy by May 1, 1964. At such time the present Metropolitan Opera House site will no longer be required by your petitioner.

"The revenue to be derived by your petitioner from the net fixed annual rental provided for in the aforesaid agreement of lease is necessary to enable your petitioner to meet its obligation in connection with the new Metropolitan Opera House to be erected in Lincoln and to otherwise carry out its objectives and activities.

"The possibility of the Metropolitan's continuing to operate the opera house building for rental to producers of musical and theatrical attractions was rejected because of the administrative burdens and expenses involved, the uncertainties and financial risks entailed in theatrical rental, and the fact that even under optimum conditions the estimated net return would not approximate the return which might be obtained from other dispositions of the property."

The lease specifically prohibited grand opera or concert hall performances.

In an appraisal of the opera real estate and improvements submitted with the above petition, made by Brown, Harris,

Stevens, Inc., on December 30, 1959, a statement was included:

"The building is obsolete and adds nothing to the value of the land at this time, and that if the property were offered for sale and made available for a new improvement, a higher price could be gotten for the plot if the building had been removed."

The appraisal concluded that the value of the property was \$7 million and that a fair annual net rental would be \$420,000. This happens to be the 50-year annual average of the lease payments as outlined above.

Two years later, in 1963, the opera association petitioned the New York Supreme Court for permission to amend the lease requested in the first petition. The amendment was necessary for two reasons: to postpone possession of the premises by tenants due to delays in the construction of the Lincoln Center project, as well as to anticipate and allocate among the parties a condemnation award that might stem from public efforts to preserve the building. The petition stated that:

"The tenant would not be entitled to any portion of the condemnation award unless the landlord received at least \$9 million as compensation for the land value and consequential damages to the landlord's fee interest."

TABLE II.—Comparison of amounts, lease versus condemnation award

Years:	Lease	Condemnation
1 to 4.....	\$200,000	\$450,000
5 to 10.....	400,000	450,000
11 to 20.....	450,000	450,000
21 to 30.....	500,000	450,000
31 to 40.....	550,000	450,000
41 to 50.....	600,000	450,000

The petition was subsequently granted. One might conclude that the opera association had appraised their building, exclusive of land, at \$2 million.

#### QUESTIONS OF YIELD

The above petition presented a capsule history of the opera, but failed to mention that there were "freehold of premises" owned by members of the Metropolitan Opera Club within the history of the real estate transactions, such "freeholds" having been signed over to management. Therefore, it is a moot point whether or not any part of the lease payments outlined above will accrue to the owners of the opera boxes or their heirs. It is possible that income realized from the lease would go in part to the boxholders or their heirs in payment for relinquishing their possession. This gives rise to the question that if the city of New York acquires the building via a negotiated sale (as was the case when Carnegie Hall was preserved) or by condemnation proceedings, how will the proceeds be divided between the association and the club? The answer to this and other related questions would not be apparent without an examination of the books and records of the opera association. Such a search is impossible at this time.

But more important, how will the Metropolitan Opera Association benefit under the two alternatives, the lease or condemnation-negotiated sale? (To beg this question for a moment, it is necessary to observe here that the use of present value analysis to value a stream of income in the future, like the use of any other formula or tool of analysis must be applied correctly to advance one's supposition or statement.)

Robert Landry, reporting in *Variety* on May 5, 1965, indicated that:

"1. A condemnation award of \$9 million invested at 5 percent per annum by the Metropolitan Opera Association, would yield \$450,000 per year.

"2. The existing lease not yet in effect, with payments of from \$200,000 to \$600,000

over the 50-year term, would yield these various sums per year, since it was a net lease."

Thus, the figures shown in table II could be drawn, showing amounts per year.

Mr. Landry then concluded that only from the 21st year onward would the association lose under a condemnation award. This conclusion is logical if one is not prepared to say that moneys to be received in the future are worth less than their face value today (this being the *raison d'être* of present value analysis). In fact, the present value of the leased fee is \$6,381,650, and the present value of the condemnation, invested at 5 percent, is \$8,892,900—over \$2,500,000 more.

Therefore, because their wish is to lease the property and raze the building, one can only conclude that the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., is particularly desirous of reducing competition in the field of operatic presentation as much as is possible. And this, with over 96 percent of available seats filled throughout the season.

#### WHY SAVE THE OLD MET?

What are some of the practical reasons for saving the Metropolitan Opera House?

1. It has the lowest fire insurance rate for any building of its type in New York City.

2. There is more storage space in the opera house than exists in any opera house in the world.

3. It has more stage space and scenery and costume storage space than that in the plans for the Lincoln Center Opera House.

4. There are more auditorium seats and more space in the orchestra pit than in the new Lincoln Center Building.

5. As it now stands, the old Met has more rehearsal space than in all Lincoln Center buildings combined.

6. The Met's acoustics are excellent—considerably better than the acoustics of the already completed Philharmonic Hall.

7. It has complete carpentry and tailor shops.

8. The 70 apartments can provide a substantial rental income to offset costs of operation.

For several years, Mr. Roy Anderson, a music magazine publisher of Mount Vernon, N.Y., almost singlehandedly has been carrying on an attempt to save the opera house. In 1961 Mr. Anderson formed a non-profit corporation entitled the Save the Met Foundation, Inc.

Mr. Anderson suggests that there is room in New York for standard operatic productions at popular prices, as well as a need for an auditorium to be available for ballet, repertory theatre, concerts, film premieres, and even large stockholders meetings. He suggests that if it were operated on an ownership and not a producing basis, the building could become quite financially successful; and that there are enough opera-goers in the metropolitan New York area to support a second major opera house, particularly if prices average \$5.00 per seat as Mr. Anderson projects. With the recent appointing of a permanent Landmarks Preservation Commission by Mayor Wagner, the likelihood of saving the building by public means has been materially increased.

The Metropolitan Opera Association has stipulated that it may back out of the Lincoln Center opera house if possession is not obtained or if the building should prove unsuitable for the production of operatic performances.

The possibility then exists, that, should the Save The Met Foundation, Inc., actually save the building against the wishes of the Opera Association, as well as the association should find their new building unsuitable for the production of opera, then the association would have to lease the old building from its saviors—a grossly ironic thought.



[From Save the Met Foundation, Inc., Mount Vernon, N.Y.]

COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES TO INDICATE  
INCORRECT REASONING IN PARAGRAPHS 8 AND  
9 OF THE MAY 5, 1965, VARIETY ARTICLE ON  
SAVE-THE-MET MOVEMENT

(By William H. Edgerton)

On May 5, 1965, Mr. Robert Landry reporting in Variety, indicated that the Metropolitan ground lease to be executed in 1 year, contains the following scale of payments: \$200,000 per year for 4 years; \$400,000 per year, next 6 years; \$450,000 per year, next decade; \$500,000 per year, third decade; \$550,000 per year, fourth decade; \$600,000 per year, fifth decade.

Alternatively, should the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., obtain enough momentum, Mr. Landry indicated that the Metropolitan Opera Association would presumably be paid \$10 million, and this sum invested at 5 percent would yield \$450,000. We assume a misprint here, i.e., the interest rate should have read 4½ percent. Mr. Landry continued "and only after 20 years would the Met lose under such an exit settlement."

The following analysis will show that the Metropolitan Opera Association will benefit more from the second alternative, herein-after called condemnation, than under the ground lease, as now written. The analysis will be conducting using the present worth or present value method of valuing a stream of equal or unequal payments to be received in the future. Present value analysis assumes that money in hand today is worth more than the same amount to be received in the future due to the fact that interest is accrued in the interim. Present value analysis is the only approved method in use today to determine the value of lease payments, and it is the only realistic method in use to

determine the value of an income stream; such as would be received under the condemnation alternative.

PRESENT VALUE OF THE GROUND-LEASE  
ALTERNATIVE

Assumptions are as follows:

1. Lease payments to be made at the end of each year.

2. The applicable interest rate is 6 percent, basically due to the fact that the ground would be improved with a high-rise office building, thereby creating a very secure lease position. Referring to the graduated lease payments above:

Present value of \$200,000 per year for 4 years, at 6 percent: Inwood factor of 3.465 times \$200,000 equals \$693,000.

Present value of \$400,000 per year for 6 years at 6 percent: Factor for 10th year equals 7.360; less factor for 4th year equals 3.465; difference equals 3.895 times \$400,000, or \$1,558,000.

Present value of \$450,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 20th year equals 11.469; less factor for 10th year equals 7.360; difference equals 4.109 times \$450,000, or \$1,849,050.

Present value of \$500,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 30th year equals 13.764; less factor for 20th year equals 11.469; difference equals 2.295 times \$500,000, or \$1,147,500.

Present value of \$550,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 40th year equals 15.046; less factor for 30th year equals 13.764; difference equals 1.282 times \$550,000, or \$705,100.

Present value of \$600,000 per year for 10 years, at 6 percent: Factor for 50th year equals 15.761; less factor for 40th year equals 15.046; difference equals .715 times \$600,000, or \$429,000.

Total present value of leased fee is \$6,381,650.

These calculations indicate that an individual could invest \$6,381,650 now, at 6 percent interest, to obtain the 50 years of payments as outlined. At the end of 50 years, his investment would have been returned to him, together with 6 percent interest.

PRESENT VALUE OF THE CONDEMNATION  
ALTERNATIVE

Under the anticipated terms of the condemnation, the Metropolitan Opera Association would presumably be paid \$10 million. Invested at an interest rate of 4½ percent, annual interest would be \$450,000, assuming that no investment management fee is paid or other expenses deducted. An income stream of \$450,000 per year for 50 years at 4½ percent, has a present value factor of 19.762 times \$450,000, or \$8,892,900.

This indicates that an individual could invest \$8,892,900 at 4½ percent interest to obtain repayments of \$450,000 per year for 50 years. At the end of 50 years, his investment would have been returned to him, together with 4½ percent interest.

In the case of the Metropolitan Opera Association, no value has been placed on a return of the principal of \$10 million for it is assumed that this sum would remain invested. Similarly, it is assumed that the ground-lease would be continued in force, perhaps with different terms.

SUMMARY

The above calculations indicate that the condemnation alternative has a present value to the Metropolitan Opera Association of \$2,511,250 more than the ground-lease alternative. This is not a loss after 20 years as suggested by Mr. Landry.

Save the Met Foundation, Inc.—Financing alternatives

	At interest of—			
	3½ percent	4 percent	5 percent	6 percent
<b>BORROWING</b>				
1. \$10,000,000 amortized over 50 years, principal and interest paid each year.....	\$426,337	\$465,550	\$547,767	\$634,442
2. Annual investment required, to grow to \$10,000,000 in 50 years.....	76,337	65,552	47,767	34,442
3. Annual interest without amortization on \$10,000,000.....	350,000	400,000	500,000	600,000
<b>BONDING</b>				
Assume \$10,000,000 to be repaid with interest at the end of 50 years in 1 payment:				
Total repayment required.....	27,500,000	30,000,000	35,000,000	40,000,000
Annual investment required per year:				
At 3½ percent.....	210,000	229,100	267,200	305,200
At 4 percent.....	181,000	196,500	229,100	262,000
At 5 percent.....	131,400	143,200	167,100	191,000
At 6 percent.....	94,600	103,000	120,000	137,500

Assuming \$10 million is needed to save the Met—\$8 million to pay off present owners (Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc.) plus \$250,000 to reimburse Weller and Arnow their costs, there remains \$1,750,000 to clean, renovate, and air condition the historic opera house. Using the opera house as collateral, the above chart indicates various financing alternatives covering a \$10 million borrowing plan. A realistic income from auditorium and apartment rentals would produce \$1,250,000 annual income. This amount is nearly double the amount of annual principal and interest payments—even at 6 percent interest.

Carnegie Hall operations for period of July  
1, 1963, to June 30, 1964

Rents collected.....	\$812,530.10
Other income:	
Hall operation.....	171,801.84
Box office.....	23,385.00
Concessions.....	14,669.89

Carnegie Hall operations for period of July  
1, 1963, to June 30, 1964—Continued

Other income—Continued	
Sponsored events.....	\$15,009.86
Miscellaneous income.....	13,028.15
Total.....	237,894.74
Total gross income.....	1,050,424.84
Contributions received.....	9,410.20
Adjusted total income.....	1,059,835.04
Total expenses.....	1,000,055.10
Surplus at end of year.....	59,779.95
Allocation of expenses:	
Compensation of officers, etc.....	45,953.97
Other salaries and wages.....	281,486.41
Interest.....	1,139.50
Taxes.....	16,062.59
Rent to city of New York.....	183,600.00
Depreciation.....	77,219.75
Miscellaneous expenses.....	394,592.98
Total.....	1,000,055.10

Carnegie Hall operations for period of July  
1, 1963, to June 30, 1964—Continued

Improvements on Carnegie Hall since 1960:	
Office furniture and fixtures.....	\$23,502.79
Painting.....	79,027.20
Carpeting and flooring.....	51,411.09
Draperies.....	37,412.95
Building (outside).....	16,160.24
Building (inside).....	99,594.14
Air conditioning.....	343,209.21
Donated assets.....	66,118.59
Miscellaneous.....	21,962.90

Total leasehold improvements since 1960..... 738,399.11

Balance due on above as of June 30, 1964..... 738,399.11

NOTE.—Carnegie Hall Corp. has an accumulated fund balance of \$388,015.41 as of July 30, 1964.



MARCH 25, 1966.

Re zoning application affecting present site of Metropolitan Opera House.

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION,  
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: One learns in life to be grateful for little things and all humanity is enriched because New York is graced with the residence of Rudolph Bing.

Were he to live in Rome, he would build an urban renewal project on the site of the Colosseum.

The destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House is no less an act of vandalism, from which mankind must recoil with horror.

New York City needs the Metropolitan Opera House more desperately and urgently than it needs another office building. All the evidence points to a growing hunger among our people for musical performance: booming sales of classical records; the vast outpouring of humanity last summer to the Philharmonic Concerts in Central Park and in Prospect Park, the continued contributions of Carnegie Hall to the culture of our city, a contribution which would have been lost had not an aroused public saved that institution from the bulldozer 6 years ago.

Just 30 years ago, Mayor Fiorello H. La Guardia had the vision and the courage to establish the City Center of Music and Drama. Certainly our city would today be a little poorer if it did not have its ballet company, its Christmas Nutcracker Suite, or the talents which blossomed and flourished at the City Center.

I dare say that nothing Mayor La Guardia accomplished in his many years of public service has so lasting a value or so enduring a quality. It is hopeful that Mayor Lindsay is prepared to move forward along the road taken by Mayor La Guardia.

It is a dismal fact that very few New Yorkers have ever seen the interior of the old Metropolitan Opera House. It is an equally dismal fact that very few will ever see the interior of the new Metropolitan Opera House. This is inevitable, so long as the Metropolitan engages in subscription series ticket sales and so long as it is obliged to maintain high price ticket schedules. But this is also immoral, so long as the tax pennies of the very poorest in our city help support and maintain the Metropolitan Opera.

What is desperately needed in the performing arts is the moral equivalent of the pocket book, to make the performing arts available to the millions in the same way that publishers have made the printed word available to the millions. We have made some progress along those lines at the City Center, at the Academy of Music in Brooklyn, at Lewisohn Stadium, which unfortunately is now departed from New York's scene.

The Metropolitan Opera House can play a decisive role in that progress. There is no question in my mind that what Joseph Papp did in New York City for William Shakespeare, an equally alert mind can do in New York City for Giuseppe Verdi.

Here in New York City where we detest those who burn books, deface statues and destroy paintings, we can conceive for the proscenium curtains of the Metropolitan Opera House a fate more gracious than that decreed by Rudolph Bing—bits and pieces of rag to promote the sale of RCA-Victor records, success or failure in the market place must depend entirely upon the integrity and excellence of their musicianship.

Early in this session of the legislature, I introduced a resolution providing for acquisition of the Metropolitan Opera House by the State and for its operation by the State council of arts. Unfortunately the legislature has not yet had an opportunity to consider that resolution. However, irrespective of the action that may be taken by the legislature, I am convinced that there is more

than enough talent and imagination to infuse a new spirit of life into the Metropolitan Opera House.

I regret, indeed, that legislative duties during this final week before the Easter recess make it impossible for me to appear before you in person in the interests of a cause about which I feel so deeply.

I can only emphasize that New York City is not so endowed with cultural resources that it can afford to destroy the Metropolitan; nor is it so destitute of economic resources that it would prove to be unable or unwilling to support and maintain the Metropolitan.

I respectfully urge this commission to do nothing which will bring us nearer to that "sad hour, selected from all years to mourn our loss." Let us resolve to preserve the Metropolitan till, in Shelley's gentle words, the "future dares forget the past," so that the Metropolitan's "fate and fame shall be an echo and a light into eternity."

Sincerely yours,

BERTRAM L. PODELL,  
Member of Assembly.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my voice to those who have already expressed the gratitude and the congratulations to this committee and its dedicated and devoted chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], for their work and for their product on this appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and Related Agencies. As the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH] has said, there is probably no one on this floor who would not add items and subtract items. I am no different from this mythical character conjured up by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH]. I would prefer, for instance, to see the appropriation with a subsidy to the arts vastly reduced or eliminated and I shall express myself further on that during the course of this debate.

On the other hand, I note that out of activities financed by this budget of \$1,169 million plus, revenues to the Federal Government in excess of \$992 million will be generated. These agencies are almost entirely self-supporting. This budget covers many proprietary functions of the Federal Government and one of the most important is the production of timber on which the great woods products industry of this country depends.

I and a number of my colleagues requested an additional \$1 million to the Forest Service and \$200,000 for the Bureau of Land Management to program and lay out sales of down, dead and dying timber and thinnings presently going to waste on the Federal preserves. Each such dollar invested would return to the Federal Treasury from \$3 to \$4. In addition, and probably equally as important, it would put on the market approximately 271 million board feet of timber in excess of one-fourth billion board feet—at a time when pressures on and the availability of timber supply have never been greater. These pressures are caused by the demand for wood products accentuated by the need for building materials in southeast Asia, together with the continuing pressures of log exports which this year totaled in excess of 900 million board feet. No relief from the export problem has become apparent except the possibility of increasing the allowable

cut by this means which, far from imperiling the sustained yield capacity of our forests, makes efficient utilization of wood supply that will otherwise be wasted. I hope that these additional sums of money may be added in the Senate.

I also must express my regret at the failure of the committee to fully staff the forest research facility at Bend, Ore. In both of these instances we have an expenditure that can be expected to return dividends not only to the Federal Treasury but to the economy as a whole.

I regret also the failure to include funds for research into balloon logging, a most promising development in logging technique which should not only cut logging expenses by reducing the need for the present expensive road system required, but should also greatly reduce soil erosion and the resultant turbidity of our streams, a major factor in stream pollution. Again, I hope and shall urge that the Senate restore these deficiencies.

Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa to strike the appropriation of \$7 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. I do so with a great deal of reluctance and I do so only because \$6 million of the \$7 million is for expenditure under sections 5(c) and 5(h), endowment of the arts and grants to the States for the arts.

I indicated last year my support for Federal assistance to the humanities. For some time now we have had Federal assistance to the sciences and mathematics and languages under the National Defense Education Act. This has been all to the good. In my opinion, support to the humanities is long overdue and, should a case be made in the Senate and this bill returned to the House with an appropriation for the humanities, that provision will have my support.

Last year I opposed the bill authorizing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities primarily because of what I then said was a "legislative marriage between the arts and humanities." The humanities I supported and support; the Federal assistance to the arts I opposed for, to me, art is a spontaneous and free expression of the culture of a free people. I cannot help thinking, regardless of the motives and the good intentions of those who must pick and choose, that the very fact of Federal support for some forms of artistic expression and the rejection of others will result in a dampening or an extinction of that form of artistic expression which might otherwise prosper. By the very nature of the selective process we will shape by government fiat the nature of the culture which this generation and those to follow will leave to those who follow behind us.

I feel also that the artist must be free to practice his art and the public must be free to patronize or reject those forms of which he approves or disapproves.

I also am reluctant to tax all for the artistic tastes of less than all. While to some, the opera, the ballet, and the legitimate theater are the acme of artistic ex-



pression; others have no taste for such and prefer instead folk music, Indian dancers, pop art; indeed—belly dancers and the Beatles. In my judgment, if the Government is to patronize any, it ought to patronize all.

But the Congress has spoken on this when it authorized the Foundation. I would be willing to accept the action of the Congress and vote appropriate sums of money so that the congressional will might be carried out were it not for the pressures presently existing on the American dollar. President Johnson has asked industry to forego expansion, to reduce the inflationary pressures. President Johnson has asked his Cabinet officers to reduce spending by \$1¼ billion this fiscal year to reduce inflationary pressures. I cannot understand how—in view of these requests from the President of the United States—this Congress can at this time vote funds for the inauguration of a program to subsidize the arts. We have existed as a country for almost 200 years without this. Surely we could exist until the termination of the crisis in Vietnam and the return of the economy to a somewhat more stable state of equilibrium.

I have had the same telegrams and telephone calls from my district that other Members have. I realize as well as they that this is not a popular position. I realize also that Members of Congress of good will and as devoted to the public will as I will differ with me on this vote. I have said many times, however, that economy in government is a selective process; it does not mean a "no" vote on every issue. It does, however, mean a "no" vote on those appropriations which can be denied or deferred without major consequences to the public welfare. I therefore intend to vote "aye" on this motion.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, among the many specific items of importance in this bill, I would like to call special attention to a relatively small sum which has special meaning for all who are concerned about the future of the Potomac River Basin. I refer to the appropriation of \$179,400 for the National Park Service for improvements along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Monument between Seneca and Cumberland, Md.

The C. & O. Canal is a priceless historical and recreational resource. As the Potomac Basin's population grows, and as more and more residents and visitors discover the beauty and recreational opportunities of the Potomac Valley, the C. & O. Canal will become more and more valuable.

As one who has been working for many years to preserve and restore the canal, I am pleased that the Potomac Basin task forces now at work consider the canal a central strand in the proposed Potomac Valley park complex. I am pleased that the Secretary of the Interior, in his message to Congress last week proposing a nationwide trails system, urged consideration of the 825-mile Potomac Heritage Trail as a possible national scenic trail. The towpath of the C. & O. Canal of course would be incorporated as a major segment of this trail.

I am especially pleased today that the National Park Service has shown its intention not to delay improvement of the canal until comprehensive park plans have been completed or longer trails have been designated. The \$179,400 in the bill before us is clear proof of the Park Service's desire to restore the canal, rebuild the towpath, develop bicycle trails, improve bridges and bridge approaches, and generally clean up and patch up the canal and keep it clean. With the cooperation of the many interested conservation and civic groups and organizations who enjoy and appreciate the canal, this relatively small Federal expenditure can bring exceptional results. As an investment in the future, this item this year has a value far above its cost.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the able chairman and members of his subcommittee have again demonstrated their responsibility to duty by reporting out an outstanding Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for the 1967 fiscal year. Through their patience and understanding during many lengthy hearings, they considered the funding of programs charged with the important responsibilities of developing, supervising, and protecting the great natural resources base of the Nation.

I am particularly pleased to note the recommended increase of \$6,288,000 over 1966 for additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service for the next fiscal year. Many interested citizens in my district appreciate the committee's approval of \$28,000 planning funds for a new Forest Service Range Management Laboratory at La Grande, Ore. The new facility will replace the temporary and inadequate quarters now occupied by the scientists carrying out important research work.

Oregon's sports fisheries resources will be greatly enhanced by the committee approval of \$100,000 for further development of the new fish hatchery on the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.

I regret that the \$3 million reduction in the 10-year national forestry research program was not restored to allow continuation of high-priority research. This program is vital to the States whose economies are supported extensively by the lumber industry. This activity must be supported with greater appropriations in future years.

Although not included in the President's budget, a 5-year progressive land rehabilitation project at an estimated cost of \$550,000 is recommended for the Drewsey grazing unit in Harney County in my congressional district. Unfortunately, the initial appropriation of \$150,000 for the first year's operation was not made available. I am hopeful the committee will give this matter serious consideration during next year's hearings.

On March 9, I presented additional testimony before the committee with proposals to alleviate the problem of log shortages which threatens the stability of the lumber industry in Oregon and Washington. The capacity of many mills to process logs into lumber, plywood, and associated products exceeds the availability of timber. Many of

these industries are dependent exclusively upon national forest timber for their operations.

This problem is complicated further by the heavy export of logs to Japan, leaving an even smaller supply to support our domestic wood processing industry. In my testimony, I endorsed Secretary of Agriculture Freeman's proposal of September 17, 1965, to accelerate the offering of timber not normally included in the established annual allowable cut. These offerings were to be made from salvage operations, silvicultural thinnings, and more efficient prelogging and postlogging utilization. Such sales would be another forward step in Forest Service practices for maximum utilization of our public timber resource under sound sustained yield management.

In region six of the U.S. Forest Service, the annual offerings could be increased 249.2 million board feet, without any additional capital investment in roads; \$457,300 would be required in the next fiscal year for manpower requirements in preparation of the sales.

Forest Service officials have also identified 141.9 million board feet in areas now inaccessible for logging. Road financing needs to develop these sales would be \$1.6 million next year. Sale development costs for this timber would be \$266,800.

Mr. Chairman, this important lumber supply program is not funded in the bill before the House of Representatives. I consider this would have been a sound investment of Federal funds, since an additional 2,000 jobs would have been made available in the Oregon and Washington lumber industry through the proposed program, adding strength and stability to the economy of this area. If a future opportunity presents itself, I encourage my colleagues in the House to support appropriations for this important program.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to commend Chairman DENTON and the committee for the great work they appear to have done in bringing this bill before the House. I observe that the committee has recommended \$34,811,000 under the 1967 fiscal year budget estimates of the administration.

I believe that the committee deserves further commendation for the additional funds it has recommended for improved services to the American Indian—a people that we have treated so shabbily in the past. The committee has also dealt intelligently with the rapid transit and conservation problems created by the booming population increases in this Nation. We now have close to 200 million people living in our country, and population experts estimate that this figure will swell to 325 million by the year 2000—an increase of 62 percent in only 35 years. The problems which this poses for the transportation and conservation experts will be staggering. Somehow, we must learn how to move larger numbers of people more rapidly while posing the least threat to our natural resources.

The challenge of building a quality society—one in which we manage to main-



tain a delicate balance between the needs of our people and the resources of our land—is as great as any facing us today. I believe that H.R. 14215 goes a long way toward meeting this challenge.

My first-hand knowledge of the good that one small section of this bill will do back in the State of Missouri is a case in point. H.R. 14215 recommends \$50,000 in preplanning funds for the construction of a reservoir in the Upper Big River in the Meramec River Basin. When this project is completed, facilities for boating, water skiing, swimming, hiking, and picnicking will be available in a region badly in need of such additional recreational facilities. Residents of the St. Louis area, the rapidly developing new Lead Belt region of southeastern Missouri, and southwestern Illinois will benefit greatly from this project.

This is but one example of the tremendous needs that continue to exist in the interior of this Nation. H. R. 14214 certainly cannot provide all of the answers, but it attempts to deal with some of the more pressing problems. I am grateful to the committee for authorizing a start on this project near the town of Belgrade, Mo.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in support of the appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior for fiscal year 1967.

I would like to commend the gentleman and his distinguished committee for an outstanding job on the legislation that they have reported to the House today.

I am gratified that the committee recognized the importance to our commercial fishermen of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act. The passage of this act in 1964 was probably the most substantial boost to our fishermen in recent years.

The purpose of this 5-year program is to stimulate research and development projects by the several States in the development of our Nation's commercial fisheries on a matching fund basis with Federal funding of up to 75 percent of the cost.

The President's budget asked that only \$2.6 million be appropriated for fiscal year 1967. Fortunately, the Appropriations Committee recognized the benefits to be realized from the program and increased the appropriation to \$4.1 million. This will provide funding for distribution of allocations to States on the same level as prevailed in fiscal year 1966.

Research and development in the field of commercial fisheries, which is one of our most valuable natural resources, cannot be ignored any longer. We must move forward—we must accept the challenges and exploit the opportunities which abound in American waters.

Not to do so would be a tragic waste of our God-given heritage.

Mr. Chairman, I want particularly to compliment the gentleman and his distinguished committee on the decision to eliminate from the President's budget the item that would authorize the use of excess currency funds in Communist Poland for the construction of a stern-ramp trawler for our Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

In July of last year, when I first learned that the Bureau of the Budget was urging the Department of the Interior to propose use of excess foreign currency funds for the purchase of two stern-ramp trawlers to be constructed in Communist Poland—thus bypassing the admittedly hard pressed U.S. commercial shipyards—I immediately wrote to Secretary Udall and the Bureau of the Budget, opposing this plan.

Then, in August of last year, before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Commerce, I was privileged to testify in opposition to this proposal. It was my understanding that this radical idea had been discarded.

Therefore, I was amazed to learn that the fiscal 1967 budget for the Department of the Interior included a request for authority to obtain one stern-ramp fishing trawler with these excess Polish funds.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the merit of our Government's endeavors to find means by which to utilize the foreign currencies we own, but before proceeding to utilize these funds we must thoroughly scrutinize and carefully evaluate their potential impact on our domestic enterprises and national policies.

It has long been asserted, by those in authority, that a shipbuilding capability is essential to our national welfare.

This has long been my conviction and that of many others. But, somehow, in recent days, the essentiality of that capability has suffered from a lack of coordination among the various agencies of the Federal Government.

To illustrate. The Maritime Administrator has been actively promoting the idea of building some U.S.-flag merchant vessels in foreign shipyards. The Department of Defense is, at this very moment, negotiating the procurement of certain noncombatant vessels for the U.S. Navy from British shipyards.

In turn, the Navy Department wants to place more shipwork with the Government-owned and operated naval shipyards. And, then, the Interior Department sought authority or approval to have a fishing trawler built in Communist Poland.

The net effect of this massive squeeze play, if carried to fruition, would adversely affect large and small shipyards alike.

Once the foreign construction of American ships is permitted, regardless of size or number of vessels involved, a dangerous precedent would be established which would encourage other agencies and officials to seek foreign-built ships.

Officials advocating such policies seem more interested in effecting dubious savings than they are in strengthening this Nation's shipbuilding and maritime capabilities.

Perhaps this distinguished committee, in its decisive action on this trawler issue, has provided a key for initiating the kind of leadership needed to retain America's shipbuilding and maritime capabilities. Certainly, this committee has demonstrated a more acute awareness of our national problems and needs than

some Government officials and agencies.

Since such leadership has not been provided by these officials, whose responsibility it is to protect and promote industries which are essential to our national welfare, then perhaps we are looking to the wrong source for guidance.

I submit that this committee's action has served notice that—unless these same agencies and officials abandon their build-abroad policies and begin to respect and implement the policies adequately outlined in our Merchant Marine Act of 1936—they may be forced to do so through congressional action.

I earnestly hope this will be the last we ever hear of proposals to build fishing trawlers—or any other kind of American vessels—in foreign yards.

The action of this distinguished committee should kill the initiation of any such proposal in the future.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, the discussion today leaves me with mixed emotions. I agree with those who argue that we must cut back on our spending that we must exercise more self-discipline. On the other hand, I do feel we should provide money for the use of the Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Perhaps what we need is a ceiling under which the Executive branch must operate. It might be well to make them responsible for the specific decisions as to where the cuts can be made with the least impact.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is self-evident that the arts scene in the United States today is one of great variety and richness. We are producing much for which we are honored and respected throughout the world. We do not lack for talent. We do not lack for creativity. We do not lack for public interest.

What is lacking, for almost every artistic enterprise we can mention—professional, semiprofessional and amateur—is adequate financial support. From local little theatre groups to the glorious symphony orchestras which rank among the greatest in the world and the incomparable Metropolitan Opera Society, all are in economic difficulty. Or as the Rockefeller Panel Report on the Future of Theater, Dance, Music in America reported last year:

In spite of tremendous growth and exciting promise, the performing arts as we see them today are in trouble.

By way of illustrating the tremendous growth of the past 20 years, the report cites the fact that the current total of about 1,400 symphony orchestras is more than double the number existing in 1939—but only 54 are composed predominantly of professional musicians.

Some 750 groups are presenting opera—almost twice the number so engaged only a decade ago. However, only 35 to 40 of these groups are fully professional, and not more than 10 perform more than 15 days a year.

The number of dance companies approaches 200. However, in the entire country only about half a dozen meet high professional standards and have any real degree of institutional stability;



only one has a performance schedule approaching a year-round schedule.

Theatrical enterprises number about 40,000 and have grown by about 15 per cent in the last decade. Yet the number of commercial theaters has dropped from 600 in 1927 to barely 200. And Broadway, the heart of our creative theater, has reduced its output from 140 productions a year in the thirties to 63 in 1963-64, while the number of playhouses on Broadway has diminished from 54 to 36 in that same span of years. Incidentally, I might mention that in my home community of Morristown, N.J., an ambitious program has been developed by the Morris Repertory Theater, now in its second year of operation. Its performances have been of high professional quality and community support for this worthwhile effort has been increasing.

Further, most performing artists, as the report points out, are poorly paid:

The miserable income of the majority reflects both a shortage of jobs and the brief duration of employment \* \* \*. In all except the small handful of our major and metropolitan orchestras, the musicians earn an average of only a few hundred dollars a year from their professional labors.

The report further suggested that \$40 to \$60 million of new support would be required annually to meet the normal operating expenses of a professional performing arts establishment. When the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities was established, its supporters did not envisage it as a major source of funds of the magnitude which the Rockefeller panel considers basic to the healthy growth and activity of the professional arts.

Rather, proponents of this legislation envisage the Federal contribution as in the nature of seed money, designed to nurture and develop new sources of private and local support for the arts and to increase audiences for the arts throughout the Nation. Without a modest Federal contribution, the arts scene in the United States, despite all its dynamism and vitality, will continue to be in trouble. Through leadership, which the National Foundation will provide, we can hope to develop the magnitude and kind of support for the arts which will permit the development of stable, mature, and civilized activities and creations which will reflect the greatness of this Nation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I support the appropriations herein for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities, and only regret that the timing of the bill was such that the Humanities Council was not organized in time for its programs to be outlined before the subcommittee. I am pleased that the report mentions this fact, thus opening the door for acceptance of an amendment by the other body.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. The Committee on Appropriations has given careful consideration to the budget requests for the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities; has made some cuts; and further cuts would be disastrous.

The creation of this foundation which is concerned with the quality of Ameri-

can life was one of the highmarks of the first session of this Congress. It climaxed years of effort on the part of many Members, including the present occupant of the floor.

The purpose of this legislation, with its very modest authorizations was to provide seed money. Obviously the full \$5 million for the arts does not begin to meet the deficits of all of the most professional cultural activities; neither does the same small sum provide the funds necessary to finance all of the scholarly research, study and publication needed for the humanities.

But these sums, prudently placed by wise men and women having absolutely no private nor political axes to grind, can enrich the cultural and esthetic life of America and its people.

To fulfill this function, however, the seed must be healthy.

Unless we affirm the action of our subcommittee; unless we plan to go to conference with an open mind; the seed will be dried and shrivel and will die on the vine.

Mr. Chairman, of all the programs this Congress has authorized and implemented, none is designed to be more free from the Federal bureaucratic hand than this one. This House could change all of that by requiring that one of its committees serve as the selection board for projects, place the heavy hand of legislative bureaucracy upon the program.

I, as one member of the Committee on Appropriations, do not feel that I have the competency to make such judgments.

I do feel, however, that such people as Dr. Barnaby Keeney, of Brown University, Dr. Odegaard, of University of Washington; Dr. Germaine Bree, of University of Wisconsin, and others in the humanities; as well as Issac Stern, Paul Engle, Philip Hanes, Agnes Demille and others in the arts are all fully competent to make such judgments.

These two great councils have made excellent starts; let's give them the tools so that they may continue to get the job done.

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I am torn between two positions—first I would commend the committee for trying to make reductions in Federal spending, but at the same time, I feel they used very poor judgment in deciding when those cuts should be made.

They have shaved \$34.8 million from the President's budget but unfortunately the reductions have been made at the expense of important, vital programs while other fringe needs were given greater appropriations by the committee.

The committee's attempt to cut spending is excellent, but economy could have been achieved by delaying the nonessential programs, thereby leaving sufficient funds to meet more pressing needs in 1967.

The recommended budget includes reducing predator control funds by \$20,000 reducing Geological Survey water resources investigation funds by over \$600,000, and contains no appropriations for key construction projects only par-

tially completed by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

At the same time, however, research funds for commercial fisheries were hiked up by \$1.5 million and a special Appalachian project was granted nearly \$1 million. I find the committee's action most inconsistent in pulling the rug out from under half-completed projects and then pumping millions into research and special regions of the country like Appalachia which has already received two or three layers of relief and more than \$1 billion in special help.

The misplaced emphasis of the committee has resulted in no appropriations for badly needed facilities and programs. Let us take predatory animal control funds as an example. Even at the current fiscal year level of spending for this program, the problem has not been solved. This year alone there was more than a \$40 million in loss from predatory animals to sheepmen alone. Yet the committee has recommended slicing already inadequate funds by \$20,000.

As another example, the committee has placed nothing in the budget for many uncompleted construction projects by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Near Spearfish, S. Dak., the McNenny Fish Hatchery has embarked upon new building programs which will more than double their current trout production to meet the acute needs of a four-State area. The project has started, yet the committee has budgeted no funds for continuing work there. Instead, it has arbitrarily decided that more research is needed along the Atlantic coast and has increased research funds for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries by \$2.5 million.

Because of a—and I quote—"extremely low volume of sales of annual recreation permits" to cover costs of a program within the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the committee has increased appropriations to the Bureau by \$450,000 while cutting out needed funds for the Geological Survey for water resources investigations. Incidentally, I think we should remember that when the House passed the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act it was under the assumption that this permit system would make the program self-sufficient, but now we find that funds needed elsewhere have to be sidetracked to pick up the losses of this program which occurred because of miscalculation.

Certainly it is hard to place priorities on many of these projects, and the committee must be commended for its ardent effort to come up with the most economical and yet most comprehensive budget that could be drawn up. However, the committee has misplaced these priorities. Before we embark on more research, recreation, and nonessential regional aid programs, we must complete our present construction obligations and make certain that vital programs are not curtailed at the expense of luxury for a few.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:



## BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

*Management and investigations of resources*

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; \$20,292,000, and in addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARMATZ

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARMATZ: On page 20, line 4, strike out "\$20,292,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,312,000."

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment would be to provide \$20,000 for the staffing and operation of the Baltimore Fishery Market news service office.

The Baltimore office was opened in 1958 to collect, compile, and disseminate daily wholesale fishery market data in that area. It has operated continuously since then in the most economical manner possible at a total cost of about \$20,000 annually.

This has been accomplished by a small staff of two men who relay the daily data by wire to the Hampton, Va., market news office. There it is published and released to the industry the same day, along with market information collected by the Hampton staff.

The Baltimore area is an important wholesale market for fishery products. It is the main outlet for Chesapeake Bay fish and shellfish, and also handles fishery items from many other fishing ports.

The daily market information supplied by the Baltimore Market News Office has been a stabilizing factor for the Chesapeake Bay fisheries.

When combined with market news data from the other 7 market news offices throughout the Nation, another link is added to the chain of market information for U.S. fishery products.

Funds to finance the Baltimore Market News Office in fiscal year 1967 were removed from the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries budget to effect savings in Government spending. In fiscal year 1966 it is being financed temporarily by diverting funds from other activities.

However, such diversions will no longer be possible, due to the overall limitation on the Bureau's budget.

Mr. Speaker, I urgently hope that the authorization will be increased to \$20,312,000 for fiscal year 1967 so that the Baltimore office can continue to operate.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, we are willing to accept that amendment.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment was discussed on our side, and we are willing to accept the \$20,000 item to keep a market news office open.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Construction of fishing vessels*

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss with the chairman of the subcommittee the language appearing in the report on page 23 dealing with the migratory bird conservation account. I note on that page that there was an appropriation in 1966 of \$7.5 million under the accelerated wetlands acquisition program. The estimate for 1967 and the recommended funds for 1967 were also \$6 million. This is \$1.5 million, according to the distinguished subcommittee, less than last year. I would point out to the chairman of the subcommittee that this program was authorized at a level basis of \$107 million for 7 years, which would be an annual authorization somewhat in excess of about \$15 million. Indeed, to maintain the pace that the legislative committee intended, we would have to expedite and accelerate this program rather significantly. I would point out to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who is my good friend and for whom I have great affection and respect, that what has happened here is a program which is regarded by conservationists and by those concerned with the preservation of our migratory waterfowl has been lagging so badly that only approximately 38 percent of the funds which were authorized by the legislative committee over these years have been appropriated.

I would point out that this legislation passed the House unanimously and there was neither a dissenting vote nor was there a word in opposition to the bill. I wondered what my good friend could tell me about the prospects for bringing this program in line with the level of expenditures that was envisaged by the legislative subcommittee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the committee is very sympathetic to this program, as I believe the gentleman understands. We accepted the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget in this respect. There was no indication that this amount was not adequate, and that additional funds should be appropriated.

Mr. DINGELL. I wonder if my good friend is sympathetic with this part of this program? It appears that the Bureau of the Budget is not.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out that this is a program which has been carefully considered by our legislative sub-

committee, of which I happen to have the honor to be chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], that it has the strong backing of the conservationists of the Department of the Interior, and indeed it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. Yet we find that the program has lagged so badly that about 38 percent of the funds that should have been appropriated have not been appropriated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend additional funds.

Mr. DINGELL. But would my good friend look with any kindness upon increasing the amount of money in this item, because wetlands are vanishing very rapidly in this country, and the prospects for the propagation of several types of waterfowl for the future hinge upon what is done by the Department. They have a significantly better record of land acquisition than the legislative authorization would allow. We are only proceeding at a rate less than that which the fundamental legislation would authorize.

Mr. Chairman, what I am doing is protesting what has been done here, both by the subcommittee and by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield further to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Of course, there was some difficulty on land purchases which held the program back. However, we are not bound by the action of the Bureau of the Budget, and we are not bound by the recommendations of the Department. What we did was to make this decision ourselves. However, when they make a recommendation, and there is no apparent reason to do otherwise, we are very likely to follow their recommendation.

Mr. DINGELL. If I can switch to more language in this committee report, I would like to discuss some language which appears in the middle of the page. The Appropriations Committee says that the committee expects that the Bureau of the Budget will continue in the policy of more widespread acquisition by easement instead of purchase in fee, and thus reduce the cost of the program.

I would point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, that what this language is going to do is to require that the sportsmen of this country who are footing this program buy this land time and time and time and time again at higher and higher prices, because this is what an easement-oriented program does. It does not, I say to my friend, buy the land the cheapest. It may get a lot of land in fairly short order, but the ultimate result of it is to see to it that the sportsmen who buy the duck stamps and pay this money for the land under this program, buy the land a second time and a third time, and that their children and their grandchildren, down to the 10th generation, will keep on buying this land.



The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. (Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. This question has arisen from time to time.

Mr. DINGELL. What you are accomplishing is that you are imposing upon the children and the grandchildren of today's duck hunters the servitude of continuing to buy duck stamps with which to pay for the easements on the land that could better be bought by buying the title to this land in fee.

I understand full well—and I will tell my good friend this—I understand full well that there are circumstances where it is necessary to buy this land in fee, and there are circumstances which occasionally arise because of the smallness of the area, or for other reasons it becomes necessary to buy the land and buy the easement, and not to buy in fee.

But this is not the intent of the legislative committee, that we should emphasize easement purchases.

Mr. Chairman, I want my good friend from Indiana to know this, because this has come up before us every year.

Mr. DENTON. If the gentleman will yield further, this question has come up before the committee every year, and this committee is of the opinion that it is more economical to obtain easements than to buy the land. However, there was this additional fact, which entered into the consideration of this matter: As long as easements are obtained, the land still stays on the tax rolls, and in a great many places if you take the land off the tax rolls you deplete the source of revenue of the area.

Mr. DINGELL. I am aware of that. However, last year we passed certain legislation designed to take care of this particular problem, and it is very generously funded. The counties which happen to have refuge lands within their borders would participate. In fact, we passed specific legislation which would make payments in lieu of taxes to these areas, on a most generous basis.

What I am saying to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana, is this, and this is by way of protest: I do not intend to offer any amendatory language on the floor today, but I want my friend to know that those who are aware of this problem do not like the idea of going in and buying large refuge acreage and buying easements instead of acquiring the same land in fee. It would be far more economical to acquire it in fee.

Mr. Chairman, frankly, I resent the idea that the Committee on Appropriations should give what appears to be instructions—and I say they are not instructions—to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife which are so much at variance with the intent of the legislative subcommittee, of which I happen to be the chairman.

Mr. DENTON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I know how much he is interested in this program. I can as-

sure the gentleman that a balance will be maintained so far as we are concerned between easements and purchases. I think both are necessary. I think we should have both, and we do have to take this into account.

Mr. DINGELL. What my good friend is saying to me is that this language in the report is not a direction to unduly accentuate the purchase of this land?

Mr. DENTON. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. Or of the easements. But my good friend will join me in setting out an attitude that there should be—

Mr. DENTON. There should be a balance.

Mr. DINGELL. But large acreage should be acquired by purchase.

Mr. DENTON. I would say, there should be a balance.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, I understand that. I recognize that but in large areas, rather in the acquisition of small potholes and things of that kind in isolated areas where they are not suitable for administration as large refuges, these lands should be acquired by easement particularly where there is opposition to the acquisition of the land by fee for the Government. But in other instances, I am sure my good friend joins me in understanding that we are setting up a large wildlife refuge that should be acquired in fee by the Federal Government; is that not so?

Mr. DENTON. Speaking generally, I would say the gentleman is right about that. But a balance has to be maintained, and there are places where the easements should be used.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to discuss one last point with my good friend. The gentleman remembers that a large number of Members appeared before his subcommittee and urged the funding of the anadromous fish program which was unanimously passed by the Congress last year. Does the gentleman have any information that he can give me as to the intention of his subcommittee in regard to this program which has such heavy support here in this body and also heavy support among sports fishermen and conservationists around the country?

Mr. DENTON. There was nothing in the budget for the program. The Bureau furnished the committee this information: Legislation for this program was enacted late in the last session of Congress. It provided for matching funds by States. The department has not received the requests of the various States, and it was not able to include a request for funds in the regular estimate. There is a strong likelihood funds will be requested in a supplemental request.

Mr. DINGELL. I happen to be aware that the States have now placed some \$7 million to support this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
*Management and investigations of resources*

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources,

except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; \$37,164,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATTA

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATTA: On page 23, line 14, after "Refuge;" strike out "\$37,164,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$38,164,000".

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, I mentioned earlier that I would offer this amendment.

In view of what I said earlier and the recommendations submitted by the Department of the Interior on this blackbird and starling problem, I merely would point out the need for this amendment by reading the summary of the Department's recommendation as follows:

Blackbirds and the introduced European starling probably number about one-half billion in the continental United States. Although blackbirds have always been with us, reported losses from these indigenous species have increased tremendously during recent years as they come more and more into direct conflict with our expanding population. The phenomenal increase and spread of the introduced starling is due to its reproductive capacity, general hardiness, adaptability to changes in land use, and the success which introduced animals sometimes enjoy in a new environment.

Losses to agriculture from birds are extremely serious and must be approached with positive action. Since the problem is varied, and includes all States, a national approach is required. Estimates show bird damage to agriculture amounts to about \$58 million annually. Damage to buildings, hazards from bird-associated diseases, and the possibility of air strikes increase this national problem.

Research has developed considerable information regarding numbers, characteristics, and management techniques. Large-scale field tests indicate the value of a compound known as DRC-1339 to reduce bird losses to field lots. The decoy trap has been improved. This device works well in and around orchards and shows promise in the grain-growing areas. Repellants and scare devices have a place in bird management and can be used by the public. However, these techniques have not as yet been perfected to stop bird damage to standing crops.

The answer to many of the bird problems may come through use of antifertility agents to reduce reproduction and through roost reduction techniques.

Both approaches need additional investigation. Greater focus must be placed on behavioral traits and physiological processes of problem species to find weak spots in their protective armor.

Known tools will not stop present losses to standing grain; however, the tools that are available will reduce damage and should be widely demonstrated to the public. It is estimated that a Federal program to do an effective job will require an additional initial expenditure of \$1 million to meet the demands in this field. Of this amount \$200,000 would be used in research and \$800,000 for supervision and demonstration of techniques.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment merely follows the recommendation of the Department of the Interior to the dollar. When we consider that our farmers suf-



fer a \$58 million loss a year, an appropriation of \$1 million seems quite small. Let us not be penny wise and pound foolish on facing up to our responsibility toward this problem.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LATTA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would this fund be limited to research in bird damage to grains and other farm production?

Mr. LATTA. The amendment would merely add this amount to that already being appropriated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Could it be transferred to other agencies, or would it be used for this type of work?

Mr. LATTA. Certainly, it would be limited to this blackbird and starling problem.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENTON. I am opposed to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Ohio. In this bill there is an appropriation of \$665,000 for the control of starlings and blackbirds. That amount is \$5,000 over the appropriation for last year and it is \$17,000 over the 1965 appropriation.

The difficulty is that they have not discovered the means to kill blackbirds and starlings without killing other birds. If they would kill the other birds, too, this could cause more damage to crops than the starlings and blackbirds are doing.

We pursued this matter extensively in the hearings. The agency witness testified, "We simply do not have the concrete techniques to cope with a full-scale bird control program." Until they have a program developed, they can not effectively use any more money than the funding provided in the bill. In the committee we discussed the feasibility of increasing the appropriation for this item by \$100,000. It was decided that we would not do so, that we had provided all the money that could be used. If any more funds were needed, the request should be on recommendation of the the agency and come through the Budget Bureau.

I hope the amendment will be rejected. We have a tight budget. Many want something added to the bill. If additional funding would get rid of the birds, it would be fine, but they do not have the techniques to do this. For that reason I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Is the gentleman discussing the Department's own report?

Mr. DENTON. I do not have a copy of that report. I am quoting testimony given to our committee.

Mr. LATTA. This report was submitted in March of this year. As I read just a few moments ago, research, according to them, has developed considerable information regarding these birds and how to deal with them.

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. LATTA. It seems to me that on the mere statement of the gentleman, that he recognizes the problem and that the matter was discussed in the committee shows that we should have some kind of additional research program carried on. I do not think we ought to continue to subject our farmers in this Nation to a \$58-million-a-year loss, because we do not know the answer to their problem. I think we ought to appropriate some money, go after the problem, and do away with the \$58-million-a-year loss.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield further. Until research reveals that they can use additional funds to kill these birds, more money appropriated now would be of no avail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION OF THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

*Salaries and expenses*

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain available until expended, \$7,000,000, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available for carrying out sections 5(c) and 5(h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11(b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the Act, but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts, and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section 11(b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GROSS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 41, strike all the language beginning on line 7 through line 22, and on page 42, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing complicated about this amendment. It simply strikes out all of the money for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Mr. Chairman, I thought that the House did very well yesterday in behalf of humanity when it voted \$500 million for food and other products for India.

In this business of continuing to take care of humanity around the world, I insist we ought to save the money in this country in order to do it. Or is it proposed to load all the debt on the backs of our children?

Something has been said this afternoon about cultural programs in foreign countries. Well, bless your souls, you are also financing those programs.

There is pending before the Foreign Affairs Committee now a bill to provide for approximately another \$3 billion as

a handout to foreign countries. We are taking care of them.

I know of no provision in this bill that had less justification than this arts, humanities, and culture business. I want to read to you from page 290 of the hearings some of the colloquy that took place between Mr. Stevens and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Stevens, if we know what the money is going to be used for, the agency is pretty successful. If you say, give us the money and we will decide how it is going to be spent later, then there is trouble.

Mr. STEVENS. I understand your point. We will conform, generally speaking, with this group of projects, but I think you could understand that we have a slight problem also if you understand, Mr. Chairman, and that is that these are very distinguished men that come to approve these projects, and if we gave them a fait accompli, they all would walk out on us, too. You see our problem.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Stevens, this is a very distinguished committee, too, but in the last analysis we are responsible for the appropriation of your funds, and we are not about to write you a blank check.

Mr. STEVENS. That is right.

Mr. DENTON. We have to know what your specific program is for the funds you request.

Mr. STEVENS. But you did say, didn't you, sir, that you did not want us to appropriate money unless we had already secured an approval?

Mr. DENTON. Let me ask you this. You knew you were coming up here to present your 1967 budget estimate?

Mr. STEVENS. Right.

Mr. DENTON. Why didn't the Council approve this program before you came to this hearing?

Mr. STEVENS. Well, the program was submitted at the last Council meeting, but we didn't approve it, X, Y, Z.

Then we come to the humanities. A Mr. Henry Allen Moe appeared before the committee on this. There had been no meeting of the Humanities Council, and the colloquy goes like this:

Mr. MOE. Now, because of what the law says in reference to the dependence of the Chairman on the advice of the Council, I could not come before you with approved programs at this time.

Mr. DENTON. What do you expect us to do?

Mr. MOE. Sir, I don't know, but what do you expect me to do, if I may ask the question? I have submitted all that I can submit.

Parenthetically, I would say he had not submitted anything. He goes on to state as follows:

I think there will be approved programs by the Council and I have been unable to put a price tag on any of them, I am sorry to say.

Mr. DENTON. What did the Bureau of the Budget do when you submitted this justification to them? What did you recommend to the Bureau of the Budget and what did they do with your recommendation?

Mr. MOE. I have no information about what the Budget Bureau did, sir.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Mark, what did you do about the budget recommendations for this agency? You have had experience in this work.

Mr. MARK. For the humanities?

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. MARK. They wrote it separately from ours.

Mr. COLLETT. The Budget Bureau determined the amounts in the green sheets.



Mr. DENTON. The Budget Bureau prepared these?

Mr. COLLETT. Yes.

First of all, who did justify the appropriation for the humanities? The Bureau of the Budget? Was it prepared in the Bureau of the Budget? Was there nothing submitted to this committee in behalf of the appropriation? That, apparently, is what the hearing record shows.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIAIMO. I was going to say to the gentleman from Iowa—and I am not a member of this subcommittee but I am of the full committee—it is my understanding the committee did not appropriate any money for the humanities partly because of the fact that they did not make out a record justifying the appropriation.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. The \$5 million request for the endowment for the humanities was not approved—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. The endowment for the humanities had a very high caliber Council appointed. This Council reviews projects and approves grants. The Council had just been appointed shortly before we heard the budget estimate for the humanities. They did not have—and they were very frank about it—their justifications prepared. So we passed over the item without prejudice, as we have done in several instances.

Mr. GROSS. The same thing is true with the arts, is it not?

Mr. DENTON. No. They were specific in their justification.

Mr. GROSS. They were what?

Mr. DENTON. Their justifications were quite specific.

Mr. GROSS. That is not what the hearing record shows, I will say to the gentleman, and I have taken the time to read from it verbatim. So on neither count do you have any real justification for this.

Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is it proposed to go out with this money now—perhaps this is the reason why all of these New York Members were talking in favor of this business today—and rent lofts for artists in deserted buildings in New York? Is that what is proposed to be done with some of this money? Is it another form of rent subsidy?

Mr. DENTON. Did the gentleman ask me another question?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to know about the housing fund, there is \$100,000 in the bill for some preliminary expenses such as planning and design to enable private foundations to obtain loans under the FHA program to ren-

ovate old buildings. When FHA approval is obtained the planning funds are reimbursed. The \$100,000 is in a sense is a revolving fund.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I intend to support the gentleman's motion primarily because of the pressure on the American dollar and the request that the President has made to help him save money.

(Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his support. It is about time we in the House started cutting down on expenditures. If we are going to spend \$500 million in one day for help to India, it seems to me that somebody had better start thinking in terms of fiscal responsibility. It is about time that we cut out items of this kind that we can well dispense with.

Somehow or other we have gotten along pretty well in this country for a good many years, for a century and a half or more, without expending money from the Federal Treasury on art and the humanities.

Let us cut out this expenditure. Let us stop it right where it is at least until we can balance the budget and see daylight ahead.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

(Mr. DENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Iowa would have been more timely when Congress enacted this legislation last September.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the Committee will recall that 114 Members of the House introduced legislation to create this program. There was no vote of record on passage of the bill, but on a motion to recommit the House adopted this legislation by a vote of 2 to 1. That settled the question. The Appropriations Committee now must determine how the program will be funded.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], read the cross examination in the printed hearings—I guess one could call it that—with reference to my colloquy with Mr. Stevens. I believe Mr. Stevens gave full justification for his budget estimate, and did it with meticulous care.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list here of the actual projects to be funded. I do not know how they could have been any more specific.

The National Council on the Arts is set up to pass on these projects. The membership of the council is listed on page 281 of the record.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to read this list into the RECORD, but the Members of the Committee will see that it is composed of very eminent men and women.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know much about art. However, I enjoy it, and I respect the people who do know something about this kind of work.

However, when it comes to passing upon the justification for the expenditure of this money, we should rely on the judgment of this fine board which has been set up, composed of these very able individuals. Personally, I intend to place great reliance on their recommendations as to just what is art, and just what types of art should be funded.

Mr. Chairman, we have many comparable situations contained in this bill. For instance, there is money for research in coal, there is money for research in water. We have boards that pass upon these projects, and we give considerable credence to their recommendations.

Also, Mr. Chairman, in another subcommittee on which it is my privilege to serve, the subcommittee which handles the NIH, we have boards composed of people who submit recommendations on cancer research projects, on mental health, and heart trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know for certain whether the various projects are good or bad, but I trust their judgment. Fortunately we have a very able council that has made recommendations for the arts program.

Now, some people are inclined to ridicule art. I do not. I respect the arts. As someone has pointed out, we have money in this bill for fishing. Some people like to fish. A great many other people are interested in the arts.

Mr. Chairman, as other Members of the Congress have done, I have been to Rome and I have been to Greece. In the past they were great countries. Today the most notable monuments to their great past is their art and their literature.

Mr. Chairman, America has grown up. Other countries finance such projects as this. For instance, the United Kingdom spends \$38 million annually on the arts; Austria spends \$12 million annually.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. In just one moment I shall.

West Germany spends \$11 million annually on the arts; France, \$8.5 million, and Italy \$8.5 million.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a matter that does not merit further controversy. We have gone into this very carefully, because we knew that any action we took would be severely questioned on the floor.

I believe Mr. Stevens took very good care of himself in the hearings. They have this fine Council to review the projects, and Congress has decided that we will embark upon this program.

Mr. Chairman, we have expended a great deal of money on science. This is somewhat complementary to the sciences.

I believe this debate is superfluous, and that this appropriation has been justified. I hope the amendment is voted down.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?



Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman mentioned the British and French Governments' contributions to art and culture.

Does the gentleman have any idea how much money they owe us in terms of billions of dollars?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know. What has that got to do with this question?

Mr. GROSS. It has a lot to do with it. The fact that we have subsidized their arts and culture.

Mr. DENTON. That is not a matter for consideration in this bill. It has been said that we Americans are the craziest people in the world.

Mr. GROSS. What was that?

Mr. DENTON. There are Europeans that have said we have the better teachers than any country and they go to their country to perform. They said that we were training their performers. This would give the people in this country the same benefit of these excellent performances they have in other countries.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, from my standpoint they can spare us some of the entertainment which they have sent over here.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, until last year the United States was the only large progressive nation in the Western World without a systematic art subsidy.

Of all nations of the Western World England is closest to the United States in spirit and tradition.

In England national patronage of the arts is vested in the so-called Arts Council of Great Britain.

When did Government support for the arts begin in England?

Did it begin in peacetime?

No, it began in the middle of the worst war England or the world has ever known.

In the bitter war winter of 1939 a private group called the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts was formed. The committee's initial efforts were financed by a private grant of 25,000 pounds. Within 4 months, however, the British Government agreed to match private donations pound for pound.

By the third year of the war, the private trust withdrew and the financial destiny of the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts was left in the hands of the British Government.

On June 12, 1945, before the war was over the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared in the House of Commons that there was a permanent need—even in peacetime—for an organization entrusted with the encouragement and diffusion of the arts. The Chancellor of the Exchequer announced on that occasion that the Government had decided to incorporate the Committee for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts into an officially sponsored organization to be known as the Arts Council of Great Britain.

Thus at a time when our English friends were fighting for their very existence, they were willing to spend to preserve and improve the very thing for

which they were fighting—their civilization.

At that time, Great Britain was spending approximately 59 percent of its national income to defend its very existence. Today, our overall defense expenditures amount to 8.1 percent of our national income. Ten percent of our military force is engaged in a limited war 10,000 miles from our shores.

Today, while our soldiers are fighting in Vietnam, we can certainly afford to spend less than one ten-thousandth of our national budget to preserve and improve our civilization and the quality of life to which our soldiers will be returning.

Last year we changed this.

Last September this House by an almost 2 to 1 vote pledged to all the people that there would be support for the artists and scholars of America.

Now we are being asked to renege on that pledge.

We are being asked to return to being the only Western nation without a program for assistance to the arts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 36, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am most gratified that our colleagues have so decisively rejected the amendment by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. The gentleman's consistent opposition to arts and humanities legislation is as well known as it is ill founded. The following articles and telegrams are representative of the opinion of an overwhelming number of this Nation's scholars and cultural experts and, indeed, of the people:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

I hope very much that New York City delegation will support in full amount Interior appropriation for national arts and humanities. This is extremely important in New York City as cultural center of United States.

JOHN V. LINDSAY.

PRINCETON, N.J.,  
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Understand House Subcommittee on Appropriations is not recommending funding next year for national humanities endowment. May I urge the importance of this funding and ask you to help in having it restored at level originally recommended by the President.

ROBERT F. GOHEEN,  
President, Princeton University.

ATLANTA, GA.,  
April 4, 1966.

HON. FRANK THOMPSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

I join with many scholars in hoping that the Congress will appropriate funds to support the national humanity foundation for the crucial next fiscal years.

HARVEY YOUNG,  
Professor of History, Emory University.

ATLANTA, GA.,  
April 4, 1966.

The Honorable FRANK THOMPSON,  
Member of Congress, House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

In behalf of the citizen arts panel of the Georgia Fourth District may I express sincere hope that adequate appropriations for the arts and humanities foundations will obtain approval of the House. Thank you for your efforts in this behalf.

GEORGE BEISWANGER,  
Chairman.

ATLANTA, GA.,  
April 3, 1966.

Representative FRANK THOMPSON,  
House of Representatives Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

My colleagues and I are deeply disturbed by difficulties facing the National Humanities Foundation's appropriation. Your continued support for this essential program will be greatly appreciated.

CHAPPELL WHITE,  
Chairman, Department of Music,  
Emory University.

HOUSTON, TEX.,  
April 5, 1966.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Western Arts Association, which is composed of art educators from 18 States, urge that you protect the interests of the arts and humanities in the current attempt to cut appropriations.

Sincerely,  
FRED V. MILLS,  
President, Western Arts Association.

HOUSTON, TEX.,  
April 5, 1966.

Congressman FRANK THOMPSON,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

It is urgent that you protect the arts and humanities legislation and resist all attempts to cut appropriations.

LUCILE F. CURTICE,  
Trenton, Mich.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 4, 1966]

#### TROUBLE FOR THE ARTS FOUNDATION

Already the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, created by Congress only last September, is running into congressional trouble. A House appropriations subcommittee has cut the \$5 million authorized by the bill for the arts endowment to \$4 million and denied the money authorized for the humanities endowment altogether. Chief among the subcommittee's complaints seems to have been that the endowments' plans for spending the money were not yet sufficiently detailed.

This complaint, however, cuts to the heart of the philosophy behind the Foundation: that Federal support for the arts and humanities should be provided, but that it should be insulated from Federal control. Critics of the bill originally protested that nothing would more stifle creativity in the arts and humanities than the dead hand of Government, and nothing would be better calculated to realize their fears than to have the endowments answerable to a congressional committee for their choices of projects.

Each endowment has been provided with a highly distinguished council of private experts, who may know little about legislating but know a great deal about the arts and humanities. The amount of money involved is relatively small. The principle at stake—support without interference—is large. The matter is expected to come before the House this week. By all means let the experiment be funded so that it can proceed in the only



way that success is possible, which is to leave the decisions in the hands of the Foundation itself and its councils.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 20, 1966]  
**BALLET: BRILLIANT DANCING FITS HISTORIC OCCASION—FEDERAL MONEY AIDS THE ART FOR FIRST TIME**

(By Clive Barnes)

The American Ballet Theater sweetly, effortlessly, and most splendidly made sweet, effortless, and splendid history at the New York State Theater last night.

It opened its month's New York season before a star-studded, indeed star-spangled audience, headed by Vice President HUMPHREY, and with no pain at all became the first American performing arts enterprise to appear with the help of a Federal grant. For this relief much thanks. May it be the first of many enterprises so to benefit, and may its future be at last made as secure as money can make it.

The program luckily matched the historic occasion, opening with a sensitive new production of the second act of "Swan Lake," which marks a milestone in American ballet. For this production, mounted by David Blair from Britain's Royal Ballet, is the first American thoroughgoing reconstruction of the great Russian choreography.

The Royal Ballet "Swan Lake" traces its ancestry straight back to the famous 1894 version at St. Petersburg's Maryinsky Theater, and is, more or less, an exact transcription of the Ivanov work.

This is one of the supreme masterpieces of ballet, not only because in its dance image of the doomed Swan Queen, an aloof and poignant symbol of man's aspiration, Ivanov created a choreographic metaphor that threads its way into the mind, but also because in the symphonic patterning of the ensemble, even more apparent in Ivanov's last act of "Swan Lake" created a year later, dance took one of its most decisive steps forward.

It is right and proper that an American company should assume responsibility for this great "Swan Lake" in the United States, and one is enheartened by the understanding that this production of the second act is merely the first stage in a project to mount the complete Petipa-Ivanov ballet. It is a first stage marvelously well surmounted.

Mr. Blair's careful yet subtle staging is exemplary. Apart from a strange musical insertion from the last act, he has been consistently faithful to Ivanov, permitting himself only a few grace notes (a flurry of pas de bourrees when the Swans enter; the removal of the intrusive Benno, that long-suffered Prince's Friend, from the pas de deux; the courtly manner in which the Prince enters to watch Odette's solo) that adds up to a production that is, one supposes, currently the best in the world.

Helped by Oliver Smith's most attractive lakeside setting, properly and prettily Gothic, but perhaps, to carp, a little hard in outline for misty Romanticism, and Freddy Wittop's elegant costumes, the company looked fine.

Lupe Serrano as Odette acted with passionate incisiveness, but her dancing, for all its swift, salmonlike turning movements, lacked eloquence. Royes Fernandez was the convincing Prince, grave and ardent, only disappointing in his handling of the one or two high lifts. The ensemble, wearing Swan headdresses that too-resembled powdered wigs, had vitality without a completely cohesive style. But good already, clearly it will be better later.

The program also included last season's triumphant "Les Noces" and that old Ballet Theater favorite, "Etudes." Jerome Robbins' "Les Noces" is unquestionably one of the most important ballets to be created in recent years. It is breathtaking in its imagery, in the power of its dancing, in its sense

of human compassion, and in its sheer beauty of craftsmanship and imaginative grasp.

Mr. Robbins has taken Stravinsky's "Les Noces," a dance-cantata of enormous complexity, and staged it so that his dancing and Stravinsky's music come together white-hot. It is conceived, as the composer directed, in terms of nonspecific folk dance, and it becomes a sort of savagely ritualistic epithalamium.

The Bride (Erin Martin) and Bridegroom (William Glassman), literally thrown together by their parents and the matchmakers, show fear and reluctance, at last warming into physical love. The work, watched grimly by Oliver Smith's censorious Russian icons on the backcloth, has a joy of life, an asseveration we had not previously noticed in Mr. Robbins since perhaps "Fancy Free" and "Interplay." It is a strange turn, but not one for the worse. And this "Les Noces" is a masterpiece.

[From the Providence (R.I.) Journal, Nov. 21, 1965]

#### ARTS COUNCIL: CAUTIOUS DARING

(By Richard L. Coe, special to the Providence Sunday Journal)

WASHINGTON.—In its unprecedented task of spending Federal funds, the National Council on the Arts is moving with what might be called cautious daring.

By recognizing the need of individual artists for cheap places in which to work and live, the Council shows that it has to fear on practical earth, and area to which dilettantism rarely descends.

By aiming to help finance acting companies for the school boards of three cities, the council shows keen awareness of the congressional bill's accent on grassroots activity. One sign of this was evident at the Council's final session of its recent 3-day meeting in Tarrytown, N.Y., in the press representation from various cities.

A half-dozen other cities have been exploring an acting company scheme through their local school boards and the U.S. Office of Education. Interest in those several cities was keen enough to have reporters on hand to flash the word. Such coverage was indicative, justifying this year's congressional action.

That the word has not yet been decided is logical enough since such a scheme would be genuinely revolutionary and still will take further probing. The plan is to offer first-rate theatrical companies performing five afternoons per week to students, unfamiliar with the world's rich dramatic literatures, and three evenings per week to the general public at "reasonable" prices.

These two schemes—housing and board of education plays—are definite innovations and came about through the self-insulation the Council has chosen for its early business sessions.

Tarrytown House is the former estate of Mary Duke Biddle and is one of several private, isolated "think factories" dotting the east coast as havens for executive seminar sessions. Removed from the distractions offered by New York, Boston and Washington, such centers provide unrelieved 16-hour days to concentrate on given problems.

The Council's members include such knowledgeable figures as the heads of the Metropolitan Opera, the museums of Toledo, Houston, and New York's modern art, the American Federation of Musicians and ANTA, such lively names as Poet Paul Engle, Choreographer Agnes de Mille, Actor Gregory Peck, Director George Stevens Sr., Designer Oliver Smith, Architects William L. Pereira and Minoru Yamasaki, composer Richard Rodgers, Violinist Isaac Stern and Washington's Dean Warner Lawson and Father Gilbert V. Hartke.

The Arts Council is actually only one half

of the bill enacted this last session under the Arts and Humanities bill.

Further, as all faithful legislative followers are aware, an authorization for funds is not an appropriation. Thus, in the middle of a fiscal year, the Arts Council has at its disposal less than \$3 million.

To those following how moneys are being donated to the arts in our culture conscious era, that \$3 million prompts a quiet smile. Only 2 weeks ago the Ford Foundation allocated \$85 million in a special program for the Nation's symphony orchestras.

Thus, both the initial actions and modest sums are admittedly tentative. As Council Chairman Roger L. Stevens remarked, "This is only a start. We are the first to admit that we've got a lot of fields to cover yet."

There are five other points on which the Council has decided to split its \$2,680,000 melon. These are:

An immediate matching grant of \$100,000 to the American Ballet Theater, which did not share in last year's Ford Foundation largess to dance, and an additional \$250,000 matching grant to be used for a nationwide tour.

Its 25 years of dancing to audiences all across the Nation, not simply in New York, makes the ballet theater grant not merely sensible but mandatory.

An individual competition of American contemporary artists from which 35 to 50 paintings and sculptures will be selected for a national tour to cities with populations under 250,000.

Participating artists will receive rental fees of \$100 per month for their work and co-operating cities must provide half the cost of the tour in their areas.

A \$100,000 grant will finance a study of how writers and directors can be assimilated from academic training to practical activity in the film field. With hopes toward stimulating an American film institute, the council has allocated \$500,000 to such an organization if film, academic, and other interests match that figure.

A sum of \$250,000 was set aside to finance new plays by known and unknown playwrights in community and university theaters outside the New York area. This recognizes the increasing impossibility of financing serious drama in New York's commercial theater and could further the aims of the American Playwrights Theater, founded by playwrights for the same purpose.

Nor are individuals neglected. Artists, writers, musicians, composers, and choreographers will share \$755,000 as grants-in-aid.

In most cases, the Council has refrained from making final choices itself. These will be left to panels of experts in the various fields, States arts councils and other appropriate bodies. And, also in most cases, the awards are contingent on organizations getting matching sums from their immediate supporters.

These two tactics, while seemingly complex, have been devised to overcome the notion that "the Government is dictating to the arts," one of the thornier matters in what is, for this country, a highly revolutionary step. Artists are free to ignore the whole affair and plunge onward as before. Nobody is dictating to anybody.

But, the fact remains, the Arts Council's think sessions have come up with a seven-point program of imagination, moderation, and awareness that the U.S. eddies beyond the Hudson and Potomac.

And that modest \$100,000 set aside as pump priming for cheaper working space is especially provocative. For despite the flossy icing, the arts begin with paying the rent.

#### INTELLIGENT SPENDING TO PROMOTE THE ARTS BEGINS

(By Frank Getlein, art critic of the Star)

There are two kinds of opposition to the National Council on the Arts and its subsidi-



zation with Federal money of American art and artists. The more vocal and less important have been the congressional jackanapes who fancy themselves as razorlike wits when they rise to talk of the "fine art of poker playing, Mr. Speaker, are we-all gonna put some money into that?"

A lot has happened to America since these clowns used to speak for a presumed majority. They can now be dismissed with pity and patience.

The more serious opposition has existed within the artistic community itself and has been voiced, thoughtfully or wildly, by artists, critics, and institutional officers. The fear is of the turning of Roger L. Stevens into a dictator of the arts. The tradition appealed to is one of considerable alienation of artists from the community at large.

#### GROUNDLESS FEARS

The alienation however comforting it used to be, is long over. It is time that artists of all kinds took time off from the writing of grant applications and the enjoyment of social lionization to realize that nobody hates them anymore. Everybody loves them. This condition has dangers of its own, but they are not those of the outcast of the islands.

How about Roger Stevens as artistic dictator and arbiter of culture? The fear is groundless. So is the larger fear of the Federal Government taking over the arts by spending money.

The Council had its first disbursement meeting last weekend at Tarrytown, N.Y., Washington Irving's hometown. It got through almost the whole of the \$3 million given it by Congress for the first year. And it set a pattern for thoughtful discrimination as to need and prospect in the arts. In its first major action the Council demonstrated brilliantly that it will be an imaginative force for intelligent change in the art structure of this country, as well as a quick and generous support for the truly national institutions in their moments dire.

#### TOUR EMPHASIZED

The moment dire alleviated at Tarrytown was that of the American Ballet Theater, a distinguished company long supported by one chief patron and this year in imminent danger of financial disaster. The Council last weekend, rushed in with \$100,000 at once, on a matching basis, plus a matching \$250,000 for a national tour.

You will note the "matching," which is part of the Council's style, as it tends to be of the Ford Foundation's. But note also the tour, for this is just as much part of the new style. The Council clearly recognizes that art is something that happens in megalopolis, a location that includes the rim of the Great Lakes, the gulf coast, and two parts of California along with the familiar Boston to Norfolk axis.

But the Council just as clearly has decided to throw a lot of its weight toward making the arts more readily available outside of the one big city most of us live in.

The invitational art competition will produce an exhibition to tour cities under 250,000 population. Thus, the Laboratory Theater project, in collaboration with the Office of Education and local school boards, will create three acting companies for secondary school students in cities where classical theater is not readily available. Thus, too, plays of merit and interest, currently unproduced because of the venality of Broadway producers will be given productions out of New York in university and community theaters.

#### FILM INSTITUTE PLAN

The Council has begun what could be a real breakout for the American arts from their present status as almost wholly a set of compensations for the discomfort of having to live in New York and its extensions.

Now regard the one new apparatus the council has undertaken to create, an American Film Institute. It will, in part, be archival, conservatory and restorative, three functions the idiot industry has largely ignored through the years. But it will be chiefly devoted to the training of directors and writers for the movies. Again, the vulgarians of Hollywood have ignored this necessity despite its obvious relationship to their own welfare.

The projected institute does two very salutary things. It rebukes the avarice and stupidity of an industry which has made money hand over fist for decades and very rarely ploughed a dollar and a half back into the cultivation of its resources.

And it points out that cinema is not stars and sets, but is writing and direction, the latter term to include cutting.

The movies constitute, along with jazz, America's most important contribution to world culture. But things have reached the State where we are out-classed regularly by the Russians, the Germans, the Italians, the French, the British, the Swedes and, God help us, the Japanese. There can be no thought of "regaining" world leadership, but at least we ought to get back into the club of civilized moviemakers. The institute is of fundamental importance in that effort. Indeed, at the moment, it just about is that effort.

#### DETAILS DRAWN UP

Frank Lloyd Wright used to quote his master, Sullivan, that "God is in the details." Consider some details in the program drawn up at Tarrytown.

They are putting \$100,000 into planning the renovation of old buildings to make them studio-residences for artists of all kinds. The actual financing will come from Government underwritten loans as already established in realty and once the first jobs are completed, the council gets back its hundred grand and can keep on doing it.

For some years now, New York artists have been moving into the lofts vacated by the light industries driven out of town by taxes and the lack of parking space. The city, in its cultural way, has persecuted the artists because they are violating residential codes.

There is an obvious chance that in John Lindsay the artists at last have someone that will know what they're talking about. Assuming such an attitude on his part, what a brilliant stroke this revolving fund is. It will calm down the artists and eventually house them within occupancy code standards. And actually the cost is nothing at all, except getting some brains together and letting them think it out. The heart of this project is the knowledgeable fusion of parts of two formerly separate worlds, art and government.

More details: the 50 artists who will get one-semester sabbaticals are teaching in colleges and universities and hence have some kind of professional achievement. This is important because so much of private foundation aid to artists concentrates on youth. If you are an unknown painter with a beard and bad manners, you find it very difficult to avoid getting a foundation grant and an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art as a young American.

#### GRANTS TO COMPOSERS

But if what you have is not promise but achievement, you will often find yourself whistling up the drainpipe for either cash or museum exposure. Another fully knowledgeable choice.

Again, the composers are getting grants not just as commissions but also as money specifically earmarked for copying and related costs. This attacks what amounts to a scandal in musical composition, although it really isn't anyone's fault. But the fact is that a good musical copyist much too often makes more money out of a musical commis-

sion than does the composer. The commission calls for delivery of adequate parts for all the instruments and the composer often has to pay for copying himself. Since copyists are rare and the work is tedious, they charge high prices and deserve them. But how good to have someone besides the poor composer picking up the tab.

#### A REVOLUTION

By now you will have noted an exemplifying strain in the grants: the council is not only doing things, it is setting an example of how these things ought to be done. Here's another: The painters and sculptors in that touring exhibition get paid rental of \$100 a month for their stuff and it could be away for 3 years.

This is a real revolution. It's one that the Whitney Museum once tried to pull off, namely paying artists for the use of their works just as we pay performing artists for theirs. The fact is that the art public, including those who buy an occasional picture, is as big a bunch of freeloaders as the Washington press corps. We have made art a market commodity, pure and simple. But there ought to be, and at times there have been, other ways to set up a cash nexus between the man who creates art and the people who enjoy it.

Rembrandt Peale used to haul his monstrous painting, "The Court of Death," about the country on rollers and sell tickets to see it. Don't laugh. The first year he made eight thousand smackers and in the 1820's that was a lot of dough.

So there are other ways and people ought to be willing to pay for pleasure received in art as they regularly do in all other forms of pleasure. Again, the council has taken a very imaginative and possibly pattern-setting step.

#### NO FALSE MOVE

Unlike poor Peale's 8 grand, \$3 million is not a lot of dough with which to confront the entire national need in all the arts. Presumably and hopefully there will be more in the future. Right now you can pick up some fantastic figures in the New York rumor mills about the size of the program in a couple of years.

But in the meantime, with a paitry \$3 million, the council has made an utterly brilliant beginning. There isn't a false move. The return will be many, many times the investment. And almost every item is so beautifully constructed that it will teach the trustees, patrons, directors, and customers of the American art establishment things they should have known before.

One final, invisible blessing: a staff is beginning to come into existence working for Roger Stevens that will, within months, know just about everything that's going on in the American arts. The closest approach to this so far has been the brain of McNeil Lowry of the Ford Foundation, but Lowry is not a public official and his information is his tools. It will work that way here, too, but the nature of our Government insures that the information will also be widely available.

President Johnson, Senator PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, who was chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities and introduced the administration's legislation, Mr. Stevens, and a cast of thousands over the years have brought in a winner.

#### GOVERNMENT GIVING ARTS SIGNIFICANT PUSH (By Howard Taubman)

The Federal Government's new presence in the arts makes it almost a certainty that the mid-1960's will be a great watershed in their history in America.

Sparked by the money and energies released by the establishment of a National



Arts Endowment, a host of projects are being developed.

By next fall, in time for the start of the new school year, there will be three new professional repertory companies playing Shakespeare and other classics. They probably will be centered in Providence, Milwaukee and Fort Worth.

They will be organized by the endowment and will have substantial backing from the Office of Education, working in cooperation with State and municipal authorities. Their prime function will be to serve as a living aid in the teaching of dramatic literature.

Perhaps sooner than next fall an ingenious plan to help a number of gifted writers will be in operation. About 20 who have published books that received critical acclaim will be selected.

The Arts Endowment will cooperate in buying up copies of the books. The writer will get the royalties due him, and the books will be donated to libraries that could not otherwise afford them.

The endowment also expects in the next few months to work out extensive ideas for grants to States for projects that will have local matching contributions.

All this planning reflects a salutary change in the Nation's cultural climate.

In the 1930's the Federal arts projects, which were making work for unemployed writers, painters, musicians and actors at a pitiful subsistence wage, were under frequent fire in Congress.

In the mid-1960's the Federal Government is investing directly and openly in artists and artistic institutions. Yet Congressmen today, instead of complaining, are appearing personally at the new offices of the Arts Endowment in Washington to push the claims of their constituents and communities for Federal aid.

The top men in the Government, beginning with President Johnson, have taken careful note of the Nation's upsurge in the arts. They are aware of the expanding vogue for arts councils and arts centers, of the explosion in sales of paperback books, of the wide appeal of recordings, of the new energies in regional theaters, orchestras, dance groups and museums, of massive foundation activity.

Everyone agrees that the arts are no longer the preserve of a minority or elite. It has become clear that the arts increasingly have become a necessity to many millions and that what they have to offer should be accessible to many more millions.

To modernize Hamlet's phrase, the arts are, indeed, caviar to the general public because in the Great Society the general public likes and wants caviar.

The cultural pot is simmering in Washington and across the land. The man who has done the most to get the fire going under it is Lyndon B. Johnson.

According to close friends of Johnson, the new President fixed on a three-phase strategy to move the Government formally into full support of the arts.

First, he made it clear that he would follow the Kennedy idea of appointing an arts council by Executive order.

Then in 1964 he got Congress to establish a National Arts Council.

Third, in 1965, he induced Congress, using his familiar tactics of personal persuasion by telephone, to set up national foundations in the arts and humanities backed by sizable, if not overwhelming, appropriations.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WIDNALL

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIDNALL: Page 42, before the period in line 2, insert the following: "Provided further, That the amounts appropriated under this paragraph shall be available to any organization, or

entity, only on condition that not more than 12½ percent of the amount so made available be expended in any one State: And provided further, That no part of any amount appropriated under this paragraph shall be used to make grants to any organization, or entity, or to pay the salary of (or to cover expenses incurred by) any person who, or organization which, in his, or its, official, or unofficial capacity, participates in, cooperates with, or supports any action which could result in the destruction of any structure, or place, of local or national historic or cultural significance, including the Metropolitan Opera House located at 39th Street and Broadway in New York City".

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, this changes existing legislation. It provides that there should be quotas among the States when the existing legislation does not contain such a provision. This is legislation that changes existing legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a type of amendment that has been accepted before on similar legislation. It seeks to protect the interests of the States in these grants and in the distribution of funds under this program. I think it is a very equitable amendment and should be accepted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Chair is prepared to rule.

This amendment would impose new duties on the officials charged with the administration of this program in determining whether grants should be made to any person or organization which participates and cooperates with or supports any action which could result in the destruction of any structure or place of local or national historic or cultural significance.

For the reasons above stated, the amendment is obviously legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 46, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$7,293,000."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but will reserve the point of order so that the gentleman may speak to his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The gentleman from Ohio may proceed.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to reduce the amount of appropriations in this bill. I spoke on it in the general debate, and I want again to say, and make it crystal clear, that I am not attacking any project in this bill. I am not trying to strike any project from this bill. The amendment would simply reduce the total amount of the bill by the amount added for 41 projects in instances in which the bill went over the budget.

The House in its wisdom, exercising its prerogative has said to the Department, "There are certain projects that we think ought to be in here, and we are appropriating \$1,204 million, \$30 million more than was appropriated last year."

I am convinced that the Department can and should, under this legislative mandate that these projects be funded through the amount of \$7,203,000, in a budget of one billion two hundred and some million dollars find this money and they should process these projects to take care of these Members of the House. We are not taking out any projects. We are leaving them in, and we are saying to the Department, "We, the Congress, in this appropriation bill, are sending a directive to you to fund these out of funds we are giving to you."

I say to you that if there is an agency that has that kind of money, \$1,200 million it ought to be able to find \$7 million to work out the will of Congress. We will make legislative history today—not that we want these projects taken out, but that the Congress wants them funded with the funds we are giving them. Let them take out some of the low priority programs, if it is a question of priorities. But certainly those which the House has put into this bill above the budget should be of high priority.

I would urge you, if you sincerely want to help the President in his budget effort, if you want to be in a position so that he cannot say, "You have gone over the budget in so many instances, therefore you must raise taxes," vote for this amendment. Vote for your projects in the bill, and see that the Department complies with this directive that we have put in, that they be funded from the \$1,200 million.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, there are numerous agencies covered by this appropriation bill. While the executive branch has discretion not to spend this money, the proposed amendment would force the Executive to assign priorities to the various agencies. It would place discretionary action with the President and, it is the Congress who determines how funds shall be appropriated. The amendment would take that authority from the Congress and give it to the Executive.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand that the gentleman from Indiana is insisting on his point of order?

Mr. DENTON. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment would reduce the appropriations in this bill in the amount of \$7,293,000. The so-called Holman rule provides:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the



subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, it is the duty of Congress to appropriate money and determine how much each agency shall receive. This amendment would take away that responsibility from the Congress and give it to the executive. Congress does not have to rubber-stamp the recommendations of the Budget Bureau. It is our responsibility to determine the amount of and to whom funds are appropriated.

In this particular bill we have cut the appropriations \$41 million. In round numbers, we have added \$7 million, for a net reduction below the budget estimate of \$34 million, or 3 percent.

In addition, income under this bill will be increased by \$233.5 million in 1967. The bill increases appropriations \$30 million. Taking that sum from the \$233.5 million, it can be seen we are \$203.5 million better off than we were last year. If we can do as well as that with respect to every other appropriation bill which comes before this Congress, we will have no difficulty.

This is a most unusual motion. I have never heard one like it before—to reduce the funds, but have the executive determine where the reductions will be made.

It has been said this amendment would not take anything out of the bill. Let me cite a few items the committee added to this bill.

We added \$250,000 to reduce the incidence of trachoma among the Indians. They have been victims of this infectious disease which causes blindness.

By the use of some of this money we can conquer the disease, because we will have the means to do it.

There is also a provision for dam construction involving \$165,000, for the Blackfoot Indians. This will make the Indian lands irrigable, so that the lands can be cultivated. Some would tend to say we might take that out of the bill.

I could go on at length. There are a number of projects involving fish hatcheries, renovation and development, and other things, all of which have A-1 priorities. By next year these construction projects would cost 10 percent more. It would be penny wise and pound foolish to delete these items from the bill.

In this bill we make recommendations below the budget estimates and have added some items. We have redistributed the funding as presented in the budget estimate. Our committee spent much time on this appropriation bill, and I believe our committee is thoroughly cognizant of the items in this bill. I will stand back of every cut and every increase the committee recommends.

I would be willing to accept \$41 million any day against the \$7 million the committee has added.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I am wholeheartedly in agreement with what the distinguished chairman has said. We have cut the amount requested by \$34 million. As I said earlier in the debate, some Members of the House have said we should not be a rubber stamp. That has been said on our side of the aisle.

Now we have an opportunity to express our will, in opposition to what has come up from the administration.

We have cut the amount \$34 million, and we have added some additional projects which we believe should be provided. Practically all of them were turned down by the Bureau of the Budget.

This, in the judgment of our committee, is merely a redistribution of some of the money.

I hope the Committee of the Whole will support our position.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I believe that the committee in this instance has done an excellent job.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] is one of the outstanding men on our committee. He knows this subject as well as, if not better than, any other man in the House.

The ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] is also a knowledgeable man in this field.

The committee has done a good job for economy, in cutting the budget request approximately \$34 million.

Under the "scatter or blunderbuss" amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio some \$7 million would be cut, but it would be cut by the bureaucrats downtown. If the amendment is defeated, the money appropriated under the terms of this bill will be spent the way Congress wants it spent.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that the amendment of my friend from Ohio will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 46, immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefore in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves a point of order.

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make it very clear in the remarks that have been made here previously that I hold the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] in the highest regard. I think he is a great chairman and does a fine job in handling his bill, as do all of the members of that subcommittee, particularly the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee on this side of the aisle [Mr. REIFEL]. My effort to reduce this spending should not be taken as a reflection on any member of the committee, but simply as my prerogative and my philosophy that we have been spending too much money. I do not think you can justify a lot of these measures by saying we have cut the bill by so much. We ought to take a look at how much more the bill is this year than it was last year. We have a continuing deficit and a mounting deficit year by year. So we had better begin to make some cuts where they are effective and not just say that the Bureau of the Budget can send up a terrifically big budget to us and then we make cuts in it and make ourselves look good although we do not really cut down on our deficit spending.

When you talk about a \$34 million cut, which is what the record shows it to be, let us look at the fact that the direct appropriations are \$30 million higher than last year.

I see the House is not in a mood now to support the President in his efforts to cut spending or the efforts of the President to keep the budget down to a proper level. Let me say that this amendment I am now offering simply provides, in effect, that during the fiscal year 1967, the President shall not spend more than 95 percent of the aggregate net expenditure estimates for the agencies in this bill as contained in the budget for fiscal year 1967. This is a limitation on spending. This provides that just 95 percent of the expenditure estimate, if they get up that high, shall be spent. It is a very simple amendment. There is nothing more to it than a limitation on spending to 95 percent of the budget estimate.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. In effect, is not this amendment what the President himself said last Thursday or Friday he was going to direct members of the Cabinet to do for fiscal 1966 and what he intimated he would ask members of the Cabinet and their respective departments to do in fiscal 1967? The President's statement last week in effect wiped away the validity of the budget that he submitted to us in January of this year. This amendment which you are offering today is a help to him in remedying the inadequacies and deficiencies of the budget which he submitted to us in January 1966.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The President intimated he is going to try to cut spending by \$1



billion in order to stop inflation and in order to prevent the necessity for a tax increase. We are simply trying to help him with this, and I hope that the amendment would be adopted.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order question.

Mr. Chairman, we have not had opportunity to examine this in detail, but from a quick reading it is not entirely clear to me just what this amendment would do. If the amendment has any application to funds provided in previous years which might be available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1967, then I would suggest that the amendment is out of order. Do I understand that the amendment would hold expenditures to 95 percent of the funds provided in this bill?

Mr. BOW. It says:

The money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

The moneys in this bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, this is a broad ax cut of 5 percent across the board. If it is not, then we are abdicating our responsibility as Members of Congress to appropriate money and we are turning it over to someone else. If this is to be a 5-percent cut across the board, you are cutting money for the education of the Indians 5 percent; you are cutting money for the health of the Indians 5 percent. The Bureau of Land Management takes in a good deal of money. They supervise the oil interests of this Government. If you cut their budget 5 percent, you would lose a great deal of money. I do not understand why these motions are made on this particular appropriation bill. This bill was cut \$34 million. When you consider the income, we are 15 percent better off than we were last year in this bill. We have cut this budget 3 percent. It is the function of this Congress to determine how this money should be spent and where. This is a shotgun cut. It does not specify where the funds should be reduced. It leaves this determination to the executive branch of the Government, and in reality it is asking us to abdicate our responsibility and become rubberstamps by turning this decision over to the Bureau of the Budget. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JONES OF MISSOURI

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 46, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation in this Act may be used for the payment of any part of a salary in excess of \$6,000 per

year to any individual who is granted a leave of absence with pay for the purpose of accepting a scholarship, fellowship, or other similar plan under which such individual may continue his education under a subsidized program, financed either by a foundation, or a State or Federal Government."

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this will not save a lot of money, but it will place a limitation—and I think cause not only this Department, but other departments, to reexamine the acts under which the employees are employed and educated under the Government Employees Training Act. That seems the basis for which they are paying the full salary to people who are given annual leaves to accept scholarships, fellowships, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, this came to my attention, more or less, by accident. However, I am going to cite this one example to the members of the committee.

There was an employee in the Interior Department—a grade 12; and I do not know what his salary is, but a grade 12 is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$11,000 or \$12,000 a year—who was not the type of employee that got along too well in the Department. So they shipped him from another area of the country down to Washington.

Well, he did not get along so well here. They arranged to assist him in obtaining a fellowship with which to send him off to school. They sent him across the country. The fellowship paid him enough money to the point where the average person would be delighted to have just that remuneration from this foundation, or scholarship.

But he gets his leave of absence, continues his salary of \$10,000 or \$11,000 a year, or whatever it is, plus the scholarship.

Mr. Chairman, I am not trying to do the man an injustice, because later from a reliable source I have learned that there are others in that Department as well as the other departments of Government who take advantage of this situation.

Mr. Chairman, the general legislation is permissive. But what I think has happened in some of the departments is that they have used that as either a directive or mandate that if a person gets a scholarship or a fellowship or some way they could go on and continue their education to better qualify themselves for a better job, a higher paying job after they get back, then they will give him this leave of absence, with pay.

Mr. Chairman, all this amendment would do is if that man makes more than \$6,000 a year we would not pay him above \$6,000 a year. If he is a person who is getting \$10,000 a year at the present time he could take a leave of absence and draw \$6,000 a year in pay from the Government, receive his scholarship or fellowship or the remuneration which he might get from some foundation that is paying for this type of education. That is all this does. It only applies to a person who gets a leave of absence, with pay. It would cut back his salary to \$6,000 a year if he gets more than that. If he gets less than that it would not affect him at all. It would affect only a fellow who is paid two salaries while receiving a

benefit which would help him get a better salary later on.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the Members of the House are in sympathy with wasting Government funds in that manner, and for that reason I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, one bad case should not change an entire law.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DENTON. No, I will not yield at this time, I will later.

Congress enacted legislation providing for training of employees to improve their job performance. This is done in every branch of the Government, not only in the Interior Department. I think you will find that private industry does this too.

Mr. Chairman, we had comment a few minutes ago with reference to cutting down expenditures. However, this amendment objects to training Government employees to accomplish this. This law has paid dividends. If it is going to be changed, it should be changed by legislation.

Certainly we should not discriminate against the Department of Interior and treat it any differently than any other agency.

I hope this amendment is defeated, because it is, in effect, legislation. It is not an appropriation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. You mention the fact that we were making out just one case. I cited one case but I know on good authority that there are other cases in this department. If the House of Representatives wants to put some restriction on this at this time, I think we should add this provision to all the bills as these other bills come along from the Committee on Appropriations and we should take care of this in order to do away with this practice. I think it is a misuse of the permissive authority given under the Government retraining program.

Mr. DENTON. If you want to do that, the way to do it is to amend the Government Employees Training Act and have the change apply to every agency and not just to the Department of the Interior. This is legislation on an appropriation bill, and this matter should be considered by the legislative committee.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If you wait to do that, it will never be corrected—I can tell you that. We ought to do this today while we have a chance to save some money here and now, and at the same time let all Departments know we are in favor of stopping this gravy train.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri), there were—ayes 26, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.



The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that Committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 46, immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that in the opinion of the Chair the noes had it.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

In accordance with the order of the House of March 30, the vote will be postponed until tomorrow.

The gentleman from Ohio withdraws the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. BOW. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT FROM APRIL 7, 1966, TO MONDAY, APRIL 18, 1966

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 625) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 625

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 7, 1966, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 18, 1966.*

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE AND FOR THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House from April 7 to April 18, 1966, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### BUSINESS ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday, April 20, 1966, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### THE CHILDREN'S SPECIAL MILK ACT OF 1966

(Mr. MEEDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to put the special milk fund on a permanent basis and to assure the continuation of this program which has helped so many of our children.

The administration is asking that \$82 million be slashed from the milk fund. It is my feeling that budget cuts that

are meaningless in terms of savings would be false economy, at best. Such a cut in the milk fund would compel the Government to raise the support price of milk and to add to the inventory of dairy products already amassed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. The result would be more expensive than continuing the special milk fund at its present level.

While the administration is recommending that Congress cut the milk fund, it is also sponsoring legislation to extend the school lunch program and special milk fund to more needy students.

It is my feeling that low-income children should be guaranteed an adequate milk diet. But how do you expand the program, or even continue it, if you cut its appropriation? If the cuts are approved, the increased cost per half-pint of milk will mean that many students simply will not be able to afford this fine nutritional supplement.

The administration's substitute plan would center about a poverty formula. This formula will be totally unlike the formula used in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Under title I of Public Law 89-10, whole school districts are eligible to receive categorical aid. But under the administration's plan for school milk, we may well be embarking on a "means test" for individual students. I do not think that Congress should sanction another onerous means test, such as we had under the Kerr-Mills medical care program. It would be reprehensible to segregate individual students on the basis of economic rather than educational need. All children should be able to enjoy fresh milk.

I strongly urge the Congress to adopt legislation that will fulfill our obligation to the nutrition of our children and that will prevent increases in the cost of Government agriculture programs.

#### A SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

(Mr. RONCALIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce a bill providing for a permanent special milk program for children. This bill will benefit both schoolchildren and dairy farmers. It will benefit schoolchildren by giving them at reduced prices pure and wholesome milk so necessary to growing bodies and it will benefit dairy farmers by providing a fluid milk market for their product. Our entire Nation thereby benefits by having healthier children and a stable dairy industry.

In the past, Mr. Speaker, the special milk program for children has grown at a remarkable rate; however, the fiscal 1967 budget request is for a drastic cut in the funds for this program with the result that the entire program is in jeopardy. In Wyoming alone funds will be cut from \$129,000 in fiscal 1966 to approximately \$27,000 in fiscal 1967. There is nearly an 80-percent reduction in









# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued April 7, 1966  
For actions of April 6, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 60

### CONTENTS

Adjournment.....15	Food for India.....17	Milk.....28,36,67
American agriculture....29	Food prices.....62	Opinion poll.....54
Animal research.....40,59	Food reserves.....43	Pay.....3,64
Appalachia.....10	Foreign aid.....24	Personnel.....3,32,35,64
Appalachian Trail.....39	Foreign trade...5,29,48,65	Poultry inspection.....20
Appropriations.....1,2	Forest Service.....1,68	Poverty.....12,52
Budget.....60	Forestry.....23	Recreation.....57
California agriculture..30	Fruits.....30	Research.....22,40,59,60
Canning industry.....69	GAO.....13	Retirement.....35
Cattle hides.....8	Grain.....20	River basin.....37
Coffee.....6	Hides.....8	River compact.....41
Commodity exchanges....4	Highways.....34	Roads.....34,39,44
Conservation.....53	Holiday.....50	School milk.....28,36,67
Cooperatives.....7	Imports.....48,65	Soil conservation.....9
Cotton.....20,22	Inflation.....61	Soil stabilization.....18
Easter recess.....15	Intergovernmental	Taxes.....47
Economics.....66	relations.....45	Tobacco.....20
Education.....14,56	International agreements.6	Transportation...11,27,55
Eggs.....21	International education.14	Training programs.....45
Electrification.....10,58	Labor standards.....69	User charges.....20
Employment.....52	Lands.....38	Water and air pollution.
Farm loans.....19	Legislative program.....16	.....33,42,70
Farm prices.....26	Life insurance.....35	Water users.....18
Farmers Union.....31	Lumber.....46	Watersheds.....49
Federal aid.....63	Marketing orders.....21	World trade.....29
Food and drugs.....51	Meat imports.....65	
Food for freedom.....7,25	Meat inspection.....20	

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed: Interior appropriation bill, Treasury, Post Office, Executive Office appropriation bill, pay-fringe benefits bill. Senate passed food-for-India resolution. Senate committee tabled bills to: authorize economic emergency farm loans; authorize egg marketing orders; authorize meat and poultry user charges; and authorize user charges for cotton, tobacco, and grain inspection. Rep. Curtis criticized international commodity agreements, including coffee agreement. Rep. Olson commended accomplishments of cooperatives under AID program and urged their use in Food for Freedom program. (continued on page 9)

HOUSE

1. INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967. Passed, 370 to 16, with an amendment this bill, H. R. 14215, which includes items for the Forest Service (pp. 7383-5). Rejected, 156 to 232, a motion by Rep. Bow to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment to provide that funds appropriated in the bill shall be available for expenditure only to the extent that expenditures shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated in the 1967 Budget (pp. 7383-4). The bill includes items for the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, Public Land Law Review Commission, and Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska. See Digest 56 for a summary of other items of interest.
2. TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967. Passed, 168 to 2, without amendment this bill, H. R. 14266 (pp. 7388-7410). Rejected, 127 to 244, a motion by Rep. Bow to recommit the bill to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report it back with an amendment to provide that funds appropriated in the bill shall be available for expenditure only to the extent that expenditures shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated in the 1967 budget (pp. 7408-9). The bill includes items for the Budget Bureau, Council of Economic Advisers, and Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The committee report includes the following statements:
  - Coordination. "Many programs of the Federal government must, of necessity, be spread among various agencies. This, of course, requires overall executive coordination. The Administration is urged to give greater consideration to the coordination of government-wide activities such as oceanography, meteorology, weather forecasting and modification activities, automatic data processing, and manpower utilization, just to name a few. The Committee is of the opinion that greater effort in this connection would not only give better direction to these programs, but would also provide greater effectiveness and could result in substantial savings to the taxpayer."
  - New or expanded programs. "The Committee is opposed to the limitation of new or expanded programs unless such programs have been regularly developed and presented to the Congress. The Committee stands ready at all times to consult and advise with departments concerning problems or circumstances which might arise following the passage of the annual appropriation bill, but it takes a dim view of the use of funds, which have been justified and appropriated for other purposes, for new or expanded programs about which the Committee had no prior knowledge."
  - Automation. "It is recognized that many agencies are faced with tremendously increasing workloads and the only way those additional workloads can be coped with is by the addition of personnel. The Committee strongly urges the Departments to explore and exploit the advantages of automation not only as a means of holding Federal employment within bounds, but to provide a capability for coping effectively with future increases in workload."
  - Budget Bureau. "The Committee has specifically disallowed the proposal of the Bureau to reestablish field offices at a cost of \$316,865 and 27 personnel. The Committee is of the opinion that the activities envisioned for these field offices can and should be performed by travel of Bureau personnel from Washington and by other means. The Committee, however, strongly supports the objective of the Bureau that better coordination of Federal activities in the field should be encouraged."



to us next year which will be a significant step toward achieving comparability. We should finally redeem our 1962 promise of fair and just wages for Federal employees.

### FEDERAL SALARY AND FRINGE BENEFITS ACT OF 1966

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 14122) to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain employees of Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is: Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 14122, as amended?

The question was taken.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 393, nays 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—393

Abbutt	Celler	Farnum
Adams	Chamberlain	Fasell
Addabbo	Clancy	Feighan
Albert	Clark	Findley
Anderson, Ill.	Clausen,	Fisher
Anderson,	Don H.	Flood
Tenn.	Clawson, Del	Flynt
Andrews,	Cleveland	Fogarty
George W.	Clevenger	Foley
Andrews,	Cohelan	Ford, Gerald R.
Glenn	Collier	Ford,
Andrews,	Conable	William D.
N. Dak.	Conte	Fountain
Annunzio	Conyers	Fraser
Arends	Cooley	Frelinghuysen
Ashbrook	Corbett	Friedel
Ashley	Corman	Fulton, Pa.
Ashmore	Craley	Fulton, Tenn.
Aspinall	Cramer	Gallagher
Ayres	Culver	Garmatz
Bandstra	Cunningham	Gathings
Baring	Curtin	Gettys
Barrett	Curtis	Gialino
Bates	Daddario	Gibbons
Battin	Dague	Gilbert
Beckworth	Daniels	Gilligan
Belcher	Davis, Ga.	Gonzalez
Bell	Davis, Wis.	Goodale
Bennett	Dawson	Grabowski
Berry	de la Garza	Gray
Betts	Delaney	Green, Oreg.
Bingham	Dent	Green, Pa.
Blatnik	Denton	Greigg
Boggs	Derwinski	Grider
Boland	Devine	Griffiths
Bolton	Dickinson	Gross
Bow	Diggs	Grover
Brademas	Dingell	Gubser
Bray	Donohue	Gurney
Brooks	Dorn	Hagen, Calif.
Broomfield	Dow	Haley
Brown, Calif.	Downing	Hall
Brown, Ohio	Dulski	Halleck
Broyhill, N.C.	Duncan, Oreg.	Halpern
Broyhill, Va.	Duncan, Tenn.	Hamilton
Buchanan	Dwyer	Hanley
Burke	Edmondson	Hanna
Burton, Calif.	Edwards, Ala.	Hansen, Idaho
Burton, Utah	Edwards, Calif.	Hansen, Wash.
Byrne, Pa.	Edwards, La.	Harsha
Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth	Harvey, Ind.
Cahill	Erlenborn	Harvey, Mich.
Callan	Evans, Colo.	Hathaway
Callaway	Everett	Hawkins
Carey	Evins, Tenn.	Hays
Carter	Fallon	Hebert
Casey	Farnsley	Hechler
Cederberg		

Helstoski	Minish	St. Onge
Henderson	Mink	Saylor
Hicks	Minshall	Scheuer
Hollifield	Mize	Schisler
Holland	Moeller	Schmidhauser
Horton	Monagan	Schneebell
Hosmer	Moore	Schweiker
Howard	Moorhead	Secrest
Hull	Morgan	Selden
Hungate	Morris	Senner
Huot	Morrison	Shipley
Hutchinson	Morse	Shriver
Ichord	Morton	Sickles
Irwin	Mosher	Sikes
Jarman	Moss	Sisk
Jennings	Multer	Skubitz
Joelson	Murphy, Ill.	Slack
Johnson, Calif.	Murphy, N.Y.	Smith, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.	Natcher	Smith, Iowa
Jonas	Nedzi	Smith, N.Y.
Jones, Ala.	Neisen	Smith, Va.
Jones, Mo.	O'Brien	Springer
Jones, N.C.	O'Hara, Ill.	Stafford
Karsten	O'Hara, Mich.	Staggers
Karth	O'Konski	Stalbaum
Kastenmeier	Olsen, Mont.	Stanton
Kee	Olson, Minn.	Steed
Keith	O'Neal, Ga.	Stephens
Kelly	O'Neill, Mass.	Stratton
King, Calif.	Ottinger	Stubblefield
King, N.Y.	Passman	Sullivan
King, Utah	Patten	Talcott
Kirwan	Pelly	Taylor
Kluczynski	Pepper	Teague, Calif.
Kornegay	Perkins	Teague, Tex.
Krebs	Philbin	Thomas
Kunkel	Pickle	Thompson, N.J.
Kupferman	Pike	Thompson, Tex.
Laird	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Landrums	Poff	Todd
Langen	Pool	Trimble
Latta	Price	Tuck
Leggett	Pucinski	Tupper
Lennon	Purcell	Tuten
Lipscomb	Quile	Udall
Long, La.	Quillen	Ullman
Long, Md.	Race	Utt
Love	Randall	Van Deerlin
McCarthy	Redlin	Vanik
McClary	Rees	Vigorito
McCulloch	Raid, Ill.	Vivian
McDade	Reid, N.Y.	Waggonner
McDowell	Reife	Walker, Miss.
McEwen	Resnick	Walker, N. Mex.
McFall	Ross	Watkins
McGrath	Rhodes, Ariz.	Watson
McMillan	Rhodes, Pa.	Watts
McVicker	Rivers, S.C.	Weltner
Macdonald	Rivers, Alaska	Whalley
MacGregor	Roberts	White, Idaho
Machen	Robison	White, Tex.
Mackay	Rodino	Whitener
Mackie	Rogers, Colo.	Widnall
Madden	Rogers, Fla.	Wilson, Bob
Mahon	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson,
Mallard	Ronan	Charles H.
Marsh	Roncalio	Wolf
Martin, Ala.	Rooney, Pa.	Wright
Martin, Mass.	Rosenthal	Wyatt
Martin, Nebr.	Rostenkowski	Wydler
Mathias	Roush	Yates
Matsunaga	Roybal	Young
May	Rumsfeld	Younger
Meeds	Ryan	Zablocki
Michel	Satterfield	
Mills	St Germain	

NAYS—1

Poage

NOT VOTING—38

Abernethy	Fuqua	Powell
Adair	Griffin	Reinecke
Bolling	Hagan, Ga.	Rooney, N.Y.
Brock	Hardy	Roudebush
Burleson	Herlong	Scott
Cabell	Jacobs	Sweeney
Cameron	Johnson, Okla.	Tenzer
Chelf	Keogh	Toll
Colmer	Matthews	Tunney
Dowdy	Miller	Whitten
Dyal	Murray	Williams
Farbstein	Nix	Willis
Fino	Patman	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill as amended was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Adair.  
Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Brock.  
Mr. Toll with Mr. Reinecke.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Nix.  
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Roudebush.  
Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Sweeney.  
Mr. Miller with Mr. Madden.  
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Dowdy.  
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Chelf.  
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Scott.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Dyal.  
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Murray.  
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Willis.  
Mr. Williams with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.  
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Cameron.  
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Fuqua.  
Mr. Patman with Mr. Abernethy.  
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. ASHLEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The further unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to recommit the bill, H.R. 14215, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1967.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Bow moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to that committee to report it back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 46, immediately before line 22, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 302. Money appropriated in this Act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate net expenditures of all items provided for herein beyond 95 percent of the total aggregate net expenditures estimated therefor in the budget for 1967 (H. Doc. 335)."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 156, nays 232, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—156

Abbutt	Broomfield	Conte
Anderson, Ill.	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Andrews,	Broyhill, N.C.	Cramer
Glenn	Broyhill, Va.	Cunningham
Arends	Buchanan	Curtin
Ashbrook	Burton, Utah	Curtis
Ashmore	Byrnes, Wis.	Dague
Ayres	Cahill	Davis, Ga.
Bates	Callaway	Davis, Wis.
Battin	Carter	Derwinski
Belcher	Cederberg	Devine
Bell	Chamberlain	Dickinson
Bennett	Clancy	Dole
Berry	Clausen,	Dorn
Betts	Don H.	Duncan, Tenn.
Bolton	Clawson, Del	Dwyer
Bow	Cleveland	Edwards, Ala.
Bray	Collier	Ellsworth
Brooks	Conable	Erlenborn



Findley  
Fisher  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Fountain  
Frelinghuysen  
Fulton, Pa.  
Gathings  
Gettys  
Goodell  
Gross  
Grover  
Gurney  
Haley  
Hall  
Halleck  
Halpern  
Hansen, Idaho  
Harsha  
Harvey, Ind.  
Harvey, Mich.  
Henderson  
Horton  
Hosmer  
Hutchinson  
Jarman  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Keith  
King, N.Y.  
Kunkel  
Kupferman  
Laird

Langen  
Latta  
Lennon  
Lipscomb  
McClory  
McCulloch  
McEwen  
MacGregor  
Mackie  
Mailliard  
Martin, Ala.  
Martin, Mass.  
Martin, Nebr.  
Mathias  
May  
Michel  
Minshall  
Mize  
Moore  
Morse  
Morton  
Mosher  
Nelsen  
O'Konski  
O'Neal, Ga.  
Ottinger  
Passman  
Pelly  
Pickle  
Pirnie  
Poff  
Quile  
Quillen  
Randall

Reld, Ill.  
Reid, N.Y.  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Robison  
Rumsfeld  
Satterfield  
Saylor  
Schneebell  
Schweiker  
Selden  
Shriver  
Skubitz  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, N.Y.  
Springer  
Stafford  
Stanton  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Teague, Calif.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Tuck  
Utt  
Walker, Miss.  
Watkins  
Watson  
Weltner  
Whalley  
Whitener  
Widnall  
Wilson, Bob  
Wolf  
Wylder  
Younger

## NAYS—232

Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Andrews, George W.  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Ashley  
Aspinall  
Bandstra  
Baring  
Barrett  
Beckworth  
Bingham  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Brademas  
Brown, Calif.  
Burke  
Burton, Calif.  
Byrne, Pa.  
Callan  
Carey  
Casey  
Celler  
Clark  
Clevenger  
Cohelan  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Corman  
Craley  
Culver  
Daddario  
Daniels  
Dawson  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dent  
Denton  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Donohue  
Dow  
Downing  
Dulski  
Duncan, Oreg.  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Calif.  
Edwards, La.  
Evans, Colo.  
Everett  
Fallon  
Farnsley  
Farnum  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Flood  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Foley  
Ford  
William D. Fraser

Friedel  
Fulton, Tenn.  
Gallagher  
Garmatz  
Gialmo  
Gibbons  
Gilbert  
Gilligan  
Gonzalez  
Grabowski  
Gray  
Green, Oreg.  
Green, Pa.  
Greigg  
Grider  
Griffiths  
Gubser  
Hagan, Ga.  
Hagen, Calif.  
Hamilton  
Hanley  
Hanna  
Hansen, Iowa  
Hansen, Wash.  
Hathaway  
Hays  
Hébert  
Hechler  
Helstoski  
Hicks  
Holifield  
Holland  
Howard  
Hull  
Hungate  
Huot  
Ichord  
Irwin  
Jennings  
Joelson  
Johnson, Calif.  
Jones, Ala.  
Karsten  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kee  
Kelly  
King, Calif.  
King, Utah  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Kornegay  
Krebs  
Landrum  
Leggett  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Love  
McCarthy  
McDade  
McDowell  
McFall  
McGrath  
McMillan  
McVicker  
Macdonald  
Machen  
Mackay

Madden  
Mahon  
Marsh  
Matsunaga  
Meeds  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Moeller  
Monagan  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morris  
Morrison  
Moss  
Multer  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
O'Brien  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
Olsen, Mont.  
Olson, Minn.  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Patten  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Philbin  
Pike  
Poage  
Pool  
Price  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Race  
Redlin  
Rees  
Reifel  
Resnick  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Rivers, S.C.  
Rivers, Alaska  
Roberts  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Ronan  
Roncalio  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Roybal  
Ryan  
St Germain  
St. Onge  
Scheuer  
Schisler  
Schmidhauser  
Secrest  
Senner  
Shipley  
Sickles  
Sikes

Sisk  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Va.  
Staggers  
Stalbaum  
Steed  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Taylor  
Thomas  
Thompson, N.J.  
Walker, N. Mex.

Todd  
Trimble  
Tupper  
Tuten  
Udall  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Vivian  
Waggonner  
Thompson, N.J.  
Walker, N. Mex.

Watts  
White, Idaho  
White, Tex.  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Yates  
Young  
Zablocki

Clevenger  
Cohelan  
Collier  
Conable  
Conte  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Corbett  
Corman  
Craley  
Cramer  
Culver  
Cunningham  
Curtin  
Daddario  
Dague  
Daniels  
Davis, Ga.  
Dawson  
de la Garza  
Delaney  
Dent  
Denton  
Derwinski  
Devine  
Dickinson  
Diggs  
Dingell  
Dole  
Donohue  
Dorn  
Downing  
Dulski  
Duncan, Oreg.  
Duncan, Tenn.  
Dwyer  
Edmondson  
Edwards, Ala.  
Edwards, Calif.  
Edwards, La.  
Ellsworth  
Erlenborn  
Evans, Colo.  
Everett  
Evins, Tenn.  
Fallon  
Farnsley  
Farnum  
Fascell  
Feighan  
Findley  
Fisher  
Flood  
Flynt  
Fogarty  
Foley  
Ford, Gerald R.  
Ford,  
William D.

Howard  
Hull  
Hungate  
Huot  
Hutchinson  
Ichord  
Irwin  
Jarman  
Jennings  
Joelson  
Johnson, Calif.  
Johnson, Pa.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Jones, Mo.  
Jones, N.C.  
Karsten  
Karth  
Kastenmeier  
Kee  
Keith  
Kelly  
King, Calif.  
King, N.Y.  
King, Utah  
Kirwan  
Kluczynski  
Kornegay  
Krebs  
Kunkel  
Kupferman  
Landrum  
Langen  
Latta  
Leggett  
Lennon  
Lipscomb  
Long, La.  
Long, Md.  
Love  
McCarthy  
McClory  
McCulloch  
McDade  
McDowell  
McEwen  
McFall  
McGrath  
McMillan  
McVicker  
Macdonald  
MacGregor  
Machen  
Mackay  
Mackie  
Madden  
Mahon  
Mailliard  
Marsh  
Martin, Ala.  
Martin, Mass.  
Martin, Nebr.  
Mathias  
Matsunaga  
May  
Meeds  
Mills  
Minish  
Mink  
Mize  
Moeller  
Monagan  
Moore  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morris  
Morrison  
Morse  
Morton  
Mosher  
Moss  
Multer  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nelsen  
O'Brien  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
O'Konski  
Olsen, Mont.  
Olson, Minn.  
O'Neal, Ga.  
O'Neill, Mass.  
Ottinger  
Passman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Philbin  
Pickle  
Pike  
Pirnie

Poage  
Poff  
Pool  
Price  
Pucinski  
Purcell  
Quile  
Quillen  
Race  
Randall  
Redlin  
Rees  
Reid, Ill.  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reifel  
Resnick  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Rivers, Alaska  
Roberts  
Robison  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Ronan  
Roncalio  
Rooney, Pa.  
Rosenthal  
Rostenkowski  
Roush  
Roybal  
Rumsfeld  
Ryan  
Satterfield  
St Germain  
St. Onge  
Saylor  
Scheuer  
Schisler  
Schmidhauser  
Schneebell  
Schweiker  
Secrest  
Selden  
Senner  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sickles  
Sikes  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Slack  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, N.Y.  
Springer  
Stafford  
Staggers  
Stalbaum  
Stanton  
Steed  
Stephens  
Stratton  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Thomas  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Trimble  
Tuck  
Tupper  
Tuten  
Udall  
Ullman  
Utt  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Vigorito  
Vivian  
Waggonner  
Walker, N. Mex.  
Watkins  
Watson  
Watts  
Weltner  
Whalley  
White, Idaho  
White, Tex.  
Whitener  
Widnall  
Wilson, Bob  
Wilson,  
Charles H.  
Wolf  
Wright  
Wyatt  
Yates  
Young  
Younger  
Zablocki

## NOT VOTING—44

Abernethy  
Adair  
Boiling  
Brock  
Burleson  
Cabell  
Cameron  
Chelf  
Colmer  
Dowdy  
Dyal  
Evins, Tenn.  
Farbstein  
Fino

Fuqua  
Griffin  
Hardy  
Hawkins  
Herlong  
Jacobs  
Johnson, Okla.  
Keogh  
Matthews  
Miller  
Murray  
Nix  
Patman  
Powell

Reinecke  
Rooney, N.Y.  
Roudebush  
Scott  
Sweeney  
Talcott  
Teague, Tex.  
Tenzer  
Thompson, Tex.  
Toll  
Tunney  
Whitten  
Williams  
Willis

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Griffin for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
Mr. Roudebush for, with Mr. Rooney of New York against.  
Mr. Adair for, with Mr. Miller against.  
Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Patman against.  
Mr. Talcott for, with Mr. Hardy against.  
Mr. Reinecke for, with Mr. Sweeney against.

Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Jacobs against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Herlong with Mr. Tenzer.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Farbstein.  
Mr. Dyal with Mr. Nix.  
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Toll.  
Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Thompson of Texas.  
Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. Williams.  
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Whitten.  
Mr. Cameron with Mr. Willis.  
Mr. Cabell with Mr. Abernethy.  
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Scott.  
Mr. Matthews with Mr. Colmer.  
Mr. Powell with Mr. Tunney.  
Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Murray.

Mr. CONTE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 370, nays 16, not voting 46, as follows:

[Roll No. 61]

YEAS—370

Abbutt  
Adair  
Adams  
Addabbo  
Albert  
Anderson, Ill.  
Anderson, Tenn.  
Andrews, George W.  
Andrews, Glenn  
Andrews, N. Dak.  
Annunzio  
Arends  
Ashbrook  
Ashley  
Ashmore  
Aspinall  
Ayres

Bandstra  
Baring  
Barrett  
Bates  
Battin  
Beckworth  
Belcher  
Bell  
Bennett  
Berry  
Betts  
Bingham  
Blatnik  
Boggs  
Boland  
Brademas  
Bray  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Brown, Calif.  
Brown, Ohio

Broyhill, N.C.  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buchanan  
Burke  
Burton, Calif.  
Burton, Utah  
Byrne, Pa.  
Cahill  
Callan  
Carey  
Carter  
Casey  
Cederberg  
Celler  
Chamberlain  
Clancy  
Clark  
Clausen,  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del.  
Cleveland



## NAYS—16

Bolton	Goodell	Minshall
Bow	Gross	Todd
Byrnes, Wis.	Grover	Walker, Miss.
Callaway	Hall	Wydler
Curtis	Lalrd	
Davis, Wis.	Michel	

## NOT VOTING—46

Abernethy	Hanna	Rooney, N.Y.
Bolling	Hardy	Roudebush
Brock	Hawkins	Scott
Burleson	Hébert	Smith, Calif.
Cabell	Herlong	Smith, Va.
Cameron	Jacobs	Sweeney
Chelf	Johnson, Okla.	Teague, Tex.
Colmer	Keogh	Tenzer
Dow	Matthews	Thompson, N.J.
Dowdy	Miller	Toll
Dyal	Murray	Tunney
Farbstein	Nix	Whitten
Fino	Patman	Williams
Fraser	Powell	Willis
Fuqua	Reinecke	
Griffin	Rivers, S.C.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Griffin.  
 Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Fino.  
 Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Brock.  
 Mr. Patman with Mr. Roudebush.  
 Mr. Tunney with Mr. Reinecke.  
 Mr. Hardy with Mr. Smith of California.  
 Mr. Nix with Mr. Sweeney.  
 Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. Keogh with Mr. Scott.  
 Mr. Jacobs with Mr. Toll.  
 Mr. Herlong with Mr. Cameron.  
 Mr. Cabell with Mr. Colmer.  
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Whitten.  
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Hanna.  
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Abernethy.  
 Mr. Burleson with Mr. Williams.  
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Willis.  
 Mr. Dow with Mr. Hawkins.  
 Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Fraser.  
 Mr. Fuqua with Mr. Dowdy.  
 Mr. Matthews with Mr. Rivers of South Carolina.  
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Dyal.

MR. HANSEN of Iowa, Mr. McCULLOCH, and Mr. COLLIER changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DESIGNATING APRIL 9 OF EACH YEAR AS "SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL DAY"

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 127) designating April 9 of each year as "Sir Winston Churchill Day" and consider the same.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would I be correct in assuming that this resolution will not cost the taxpayers anything?

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Well, I have an amendment to assure that it will not cost them anything.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 127

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That April 9 of each year, the anniversary of the conferring of honorary United States citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill, is hereby designated as "Sir Winston Churchill Day." The President is authorized and requested to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to honor the memory of Sir Winston Churchill by observing such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF COLORADO

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: On page 1, line 3, strike "of each year," and insert in lieu thereof, "1966,"; and on page 1, line 7, strike "each year".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any assurance in the amendments that this is not going to cost the taxpayers any money.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I can assure the gentleman that there is no authorization for money to be appropriated in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to be sure, because Britain owes us a good many billions of dollars, and before we put out any more money in their direction, I want to be sure that I know about it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I can assure the gentleman that this is not putting out any money for the British Empire.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Designating April 9, 1966, as 'Sir Winston Churchill Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DISPOSAL OF VANADIUM FROM NATIONAL STOCKPILE

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H.R. 13774) to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 13774

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Administrator of General Services is hereby authorized to dispose of, by negotiation or otherwise, approximately six thousand four hundred and fifty short tons of vanadium (V content) now held in the national stockpile established pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). Such disposition may be made*

without regard to the provisions of section 3 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act: *Provided*, That the time and method of disposition shall be fixed with due regard to the protection of the United States against avoidable loss and the protection of producers processors, and consumers against avoidable disruption of their usual markets.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TO CONFER ADDITIONAL JURISDICTION UPON THE SUPERINTENDENT OF INSURANCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11664) to confer additional jurisdiction upon the Superintendent of Insurance for the District of Columbia to regulate domestic stock insurance companies and to exempt such companies from section 12 (g) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after "formity" insert "as nearly as may be practicable,".

Page 2, line 16, after "hearing" where it appears the first time insert: "": *Provided*, That if the Superintendent shall find upon examination that the further transaction of business by the company would be hazardous to the public or to the policyholders or creditors of the company in the District, he may suspend such authority without giving notice as herein required: *Provided further*, That in lieu of revoking or suspending the certificate of authority of any company, after hearing as herein provided, the Superintendent may subject such company to a penalty of not more than \$500 when, in his judgment, he finds that the public interest would be best served by the continued operation of the company. The amount of any such penalty shall be paid by the company through the office of the Superintendent to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia".

Page 7, after line 15, insert:

(1) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section, or any rule or regulation thereunder the violation of which is made unlawful by this section or the observance of which is required under the terms of this section, or any person who willfully and knowingly makes, or causes to be made, any statement in any application, report, or document required to be filed under this section, which statement was false or misleading with respect to any material fact, shall upon conviction be fined not more than \$1,000, or be imprisoned not more than thirty days, or both."

Page 7, line 16, strike out "(1)" and insert: "(j)".

Page 7, strike out lines 18, 19, and 20.

Page 7, line 21, strike out "5" and insert: "4".

(Mr. WHITENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, H.R. 11664, is to subject domestic stock insurance companies in the District of Columbia to local regulation in accordance with the specific criteria set forth by the Congress to assure them of the exemption



provided by the Congress in the Securities Acts amendments.

The Securities Acts Amendments of 1964, Public Law 88-467 (78 Stat. 565), were enacted to extend the disclosure requirements of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to the issuers of additional publicly traded securities.

The Congress, by the 1964 amendments, intended that State legislatures could enact the laws required to meet the exemption standards which it spelled out in the Securities Acts amendments.

This bill will effectively carry out the intent of the Congress expressed in the Securities Acts Amendments of 1964 and is in the sound tradition of retaining the regulation of insurance within the District of Columbia and the States, rather than delegating such regulation to an arm of the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE LESLIE L. BIFFLE

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce to the House the passing of Leslie L. Biffle, whose service to the Congress spanned more than 50 years. He passed away in the city of Washington at 1:35 this morning. He was born in Boydsville, Clay County, Ark., on October 9, 1889, in the congressional district that I am privileged to serve.

He rose from page boy to the top rungs of the ladder as Secretary of the U.S. Senate. He came to Washington for the first time in 1908 at a tender age. He returned to Arkansas for additional schooling. In 1909 he came back to Washington as Secretary to Hon. Bruce Macon who represented that district in Congress. Afterward he worked in the folding room in the Senate for a time.

At the recommendation of Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, majority leader, he was selected as secretary to the majority in the Senate. He held this position until he was unanimously chosen Secretary of the Senate in 1945, receiving support from the Members of both parties.

He married Miss Glade Strickling, of Clarksburg, W. Va., in Washington in 1921. She survives him. He is also survived by two sisters, Mrs. Charles Clark Hillman and Mrs. Blanche Sanders, both of Miami, Fla.

"Les," as he was affectionately called, obtained some fine advice from Senator Robinson, who admonished him, "Keep your eyes and ears open and your mouth shut." Les carried out that advice full well. He could be trusted with the closest of secrets by those with whom he associated. Senators, Cabinet members, and

Presidents sought his counsel. He never violated the confidence of anyone. They were aware of that. President Franklin D. Roosevelt would call Les Biffle to the White House and inquire about what was going on in Congress. He could not have gone to a better source. He was a close friend of President Harry S. Truman and Vice President Alban W. Barkley.

While Biffle was serving as president of the Arkansas State Society the group held a reception in the caucus room of the Senate office building. It was a cold, snowy, distasteful day which reduced the size of the crowd who attended. The surprise guest was President Harry S. Truman who came to honor his good friend Les Biffle regardless of the inclement weather.

On July 4, 1949, the traditional annual picnic was held at Piggott, Ark., honoring Leslie Biffle, whose birthplace was only a few miles from that county seat city. It was truly a Biffle Day celebration in Arkansas. Many thousands from Arkansas and the neighboring State of Missouri were present. Vice President Alban W. Barkley headed the large number of Washington officials who attended. Several departmental heads, Senators and Representatives and close friends made the trip to Piggott on this occasion. The noted sculptor, Felix de Weldon, made a bust of Biffle which was unveiled during the ceremonies and subsequently placed in the Federal Post Office building at Piggott where it has remained since that time. A scroll upon the bust bears the names of a number of his close friends.

Thoroughness, attentiveness to duty, loyalty to friends, and hard work brought fame and distinction to Leslie L. Biffle. In January 1959 he was honored at a magnificent testimonial dinner after 50 years of outstanding public service in the Nation's Capital. More than 1,200 friends swelled the Grand Ballroom to overflowing in the Mayflower Hotel. The requests for tickets had to be shut off a few days before the banquet was held for lack of space in the five ballrooms which were thrown together for the event. The dinner featured music and songs by recognized artists, addresses by leaders from both major political parties and presentation of gifts.

Here are some of the tributes paid to Les Biffle by speakers on the program:

He's affable, courteous, and deserving of our admiration and esteem.

His personality endeared him to the hearts of all of us.

Distinguished public servant, who knew what the word "loyalty" meant.

Only man who could whisper to Senators without moving his lips.

The Senator at Large from the United States.

His counsel was sought. He was adviser to those in the highest places of responsibility. He never forgets a friend and never fails to reward one.

Confidant of Presidents.

A pinnacle few men attained.

Walking encyclopedia.

He makes no demands; all he asks is to do something for his friends.

Never puts off until tomorrow \* \* \* did his job to perfection.

Former President Truman said at a news conference while in office:

They don't come any better than Les Biffle.

"The Arkansas Pollster of 1948." This label given him was due to his activities during the presidential campaign of that year in which he dressed as a chicken peddler and drove through several States in a dilapidated pickup to get the tenor of the voters in rural America. He reported that the trend was to Truman.

The words of praise came with genuine fervor and earnestness. It was evident that each of those who made remarks admired and respected the soft-spoken Arkansan.

It is indeed difficult, even impossible, to find anyone who had the privilege of becoming acquainted with Biffle who was not completely devoted to him. Les Biffle had the friendship of the leaders and members of both parties.

Services will be held in the Bethlehem Chapel, Washington Cathedral, at 11 a.m., Saturday. Gawler's Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

I would like to convey sympathy to his widow and to his sisters and other members of the family.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. GATHINGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] in the tribute he is paying to my late friend, Les Biffle.

Mr. Speaker, I have never known a more gentle, a more noble man in all of my life. Les Biffle was a real institution around the Congress and Capitol Hill for many, many years, and a great citizen with friends across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my deepest sympathy to his loved ones in their sorrow.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to learn of the death of my dear friend, Les Biffle. He and I were close friends for many, many years.

Mr. Speaker, Les Biffle was one of the most dedicated men I have ever met. He gave his whole life to the Congress of the United States. While he served in the other branch in many important positions, he loved the entire Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Les Biffle wielded a powerful and constructive influence, as we know one who occupies these various positions could do, in calling to the attention of the Members matters and information of vital importance which would be not only of great interest to them, but guidance to them.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of Les Biffle takes from me a very close and valued friend, and leaves a feeling of keen regret in the minds of the countless thousands of persons, friends and others, who knew Les and who benefited from his beautiful outlook upon life.









89<sup>TH</sup> CONGRESS  
2<sup>D</sup> SESSION

# H. R. 14215

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 13, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4        in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5        ment of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year  
6        ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, namely:

## 1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## 2 PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

## 3 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## 4 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

5 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improve-  
6 ment, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classifica-  
7 tion, and performance of other functions, as authorized by  
8 law, in the management of lands and their resources under  
9 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management,  
10 \$48,755,000.

## 11 CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

12 For acquisition, construction and maintenance of build-  
13 ings, appurtenant facilities, and other improvements, and  
14 maintenance of access roads, \$2,900,000, to remain available  
15 until expended.

## 16 PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

## 17 (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

18 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
19 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
20 203, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## 21 OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

22 For expenses necessary for management, protection,  
23 and development of resources and for construction, operation,



1 and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other  
2 improvements on the revested Oregon and California Rail-  
3 road grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and  
4 California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent  
5 rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of ex-  
6 isting connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an  
7 amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all  
8 receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested  
9 Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain  
10 available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount ap-  
11 propriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on  
12 lands administered by the Forest Service shall be trans-  
13 ferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:  
14 *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein for  
15 road construction on lands other than those administered by  
16 the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of  
17 Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*,  
18 That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reim-  
19 bursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant  
20 fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the  
21 Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second  
22 paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August  
23 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

## RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft for replacement only; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appro-



1 priation “Oregon and California grant lands”) shall be re-  
2 imbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection  
3 (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat.  
4 876), of the special fund designated the “Oregon and Cali-  
5 fornia land-grant fund” and section 4 of the Act approved  
6 May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated  
7 the “Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund”: *Provided further*,  
8 That appropriations herein made may be expended on a re-  
9 imbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those  
10 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management  
11 and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral re-  
12 sources for the State of Alaska.

## 13 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

### 14 EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

15 For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare  
16 services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with  
17 States and other organizations, including payment (in ad-  
18 vance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance,  
19 and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institu-  
20 tions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy  
21 Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of  
22 rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of  
23 law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian

1 arts and crafts shops; \$114,475,000: *Provided*, That not  
2 to exceed \$85,000 of this appropriation shall be made  
3 available to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe for main-  
4 tenance of law and order.

#### 5 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

6 For expenses necessary for management, development,  
7 improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant  
8 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian  
9 Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and  
10 charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian  
11 industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts  
12 and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian  
13 arts and crafts, as authorized by law; \$44,086,000.

#### 14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction, major repair, and improvement of ir-  
16 rigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other  
17 facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; prepa-  
18 ration of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering  
19 services by contract; \$55,325,000, to remain available until  
20 expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appro-  
21 priated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the  
22 States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South  
23 Dakota, and Utah outside of the boundaries of existing  
24 Indian reservations except lands authorized by law to be



1 acquired for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project: *Pro-*  
2 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
3 used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the  
4 States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or  
5 outside the boundaries of existing reservations except such  
6 lands as may be required for replacement of the Wild Horse  
7 Dam in the State of Nevada: *Provided further*, That such  
8 amounts as may be available for the construction of the Nav-  
9 ajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bu-  
10 reau of Reclamation.

11 ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
12 AUTHORIZATION)

13 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
14 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
15 203, \$16,754,000, to remain available until expended.

16 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary for the general administration  
18 of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in  
19 field offices, \$4,623,000.

20 TRIBAL FUNDS

21 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended  
22 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$3,000,000  
23 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure  
24 for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay

1 and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other  
2 assistance to Indian children attending public and private  
3 schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of  
4 admission) ; purchase of land and improvements on land,  
5 title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States  
6 in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and  
7 water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and  
8 other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved  
9 contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers,  
10 councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organiza-  
11 tions, including mileage for use of privately owned automom-  
12 biles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established  
13 administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian  
14 employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without  
15 regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat.  
16 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator  
17 for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the  
18 approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to  
19 the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the  
20 amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced  
21 to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such pur-  
22 poses as may be designated by the governing body of the  
23 particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary:  
24 *Provided further*, That funds derived from appropriations in



1 satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and  
2 the Court of Claims shall not be available for advances,  
3 except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney  
4 fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program plan-  
5 ning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth  
6 the purposes for which said funds will be used: *Provided,*  
7 *however,* That no part of this appropriation or other tribal  
8 funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights  
9 within the States of Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Wyo-  
10 ming, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing  
11 Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the prop-  
12 erty being exempted from local taxation, except as provided  
13 for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

14 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

15 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except  
16 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of  
17 exhibits; purchase of not to exceed ninety-three passenger  
18 motor vehicles (including thirty-five for police-type use  
19 which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price  
20 limitation for the current fiscal year), of which seventy shall  
21 be for replacement only, which may be used for the trans-  
22 portation of Indians; advance payments for service (includ-  
23 ing services which may extend beyond the current fiscal

1 year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June  
2 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70  
3 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision  
4 over certain Indian tribes; and expenses required by con-  
5 tinuing or permanent treaty provisions.

6 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recrea-  
9 tion, not otherwise provided for, \$3,910,000.

10 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

11 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
12 the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78  
13 Stat. 897), including \$2,560,000 for administrative expenses  
14 of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal  
15 year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interests therein,  
16 in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the  
17 State or Federal agency concerned, to be derived from the  
18 Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2  
19 of said Act, and to remain available until expended, not to  
20 exceed \$110,000,000 of which (1) not to exceed \$76,-  
21 203,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be  
22 matched by the individual States with an equal amount;  
23 (2) not to exceed \$17,971,500 shall be available to the  
24 National Park Service; (3) not to exceed \$13,093,000



shall be available to the Forest Service; and (4) not to exceed \$172,500 shall be available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: *Provided*, That in the event the receipts available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund are insufficient to provide the full amounts specified herein, the amounts available under clauses (1) through (4) shall be reduced proportionately.

## OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

### ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1661 (c) ) ; salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of the immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591, 72 Stat. 1095) ; compensation and mileage of members of the legislature in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. sec. 1661 (c) ) ; compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661 (c) ) ; grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental func-

1 tions; loans and grants to Guam, as authorized by law (Pub-  
2 lic Law 88-170) ; and personal services, household equip-  
3 ment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation  
4 of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American  
5 Samoa; \$10,513,000, to remain available until expended:  
6 *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein  
7 provided for are authorized to make purchases through the  
8 General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That  
9 appropriations available for the administration of Territories  
10 may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance,  
11 and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official  
12 purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found  
13 by the Secretary to be necessary.

14 TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

15 For expenses necessary for the Department of the In-  
16 terior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
17 Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
18 joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the  
19 Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat.  
20 171), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of  
21 the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and  
22 expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pa-  
23 cific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
24 Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of govern-  
25 mental functions; \$17,494,000, to remain available until



1 expended: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the  
2 Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies  
3 or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust  
4 Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting  
5 Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget  
6 and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended,  
7 and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64  
8 Stat. 834): *Provided further*, That the government of the  
9 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make  
10 purchases through the General Services Administration:  
11 *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the ad-  
12 ministration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may  
13 be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and  
14 operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes  
15 and for commercial transportation purposes found by the  
16 Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of  
17 article 6(2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
18 Congress.

## 19 ALASKA RAILROAD

### 20 ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

21 The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue  
22 available until expended for the work authorized by law,  
23 including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or  
24 coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with

1 other branches of the Government service, for the purpose  
2 of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight,  
3 passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit  
4 and development of industries or travel in the area  
5 served; and payment of compensation and expenses as  
6 authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916  
7 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided:  
8 *Provided*, That no employee shall be paid an annual salary  
9 out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the  
10 Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS-15,  
11 except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant  
12 general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by  
13 said Act for GS-17, and five officers at not to exceed the  
14 salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS-16.

## 15 MINERAL RESOURCES

### 16 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

#### 17 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

18 For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to per-  
19 form surveys, investigations, and research covering topog-  
20 raphy, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the  
21 United States, its Territories and possessions, and other  
22 areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837 and 76 Stat. 427) ;  
23 classify lands as to mineral character and water and power



1 resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and  
2 Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental  
3 regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases,  
4 permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the inter-  
5 state shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15  
6 U.S.C. 715) ; administer the minerals exploration program  
7 (30 U.S.C. 641) ; and publish and disseminate data rela-  
8 tive to the foregoing activities; \$72,782,000, of which  
9 \$12,350,000 shall be available only for cooperation with  
10 States or municipalities for water resources investigations, and  
11 \$216,000 shall remain available until expended, to provide  
12 financial assistance to participants in minerals exploration  
13 projects, as authorized by law (30 U.S.C. 641-646) , includ-  
14 ing administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30,  
15 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of  
16 1950, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropri-  
17 ation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any  
18 topographic mapping or water resources investigations car-  
19 ried on in cooperation with any State, or municipality.

#### 20 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

21 The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall  
22 be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-six pas-

1 senger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimburse-  
2 ment of the General Services Administration for security  
3 guard service for protection of confidential files; con-  
4 tracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the  
5 making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it  
6 is administratively determined that such procedures are in  
7 the public interest; construction and maintenance of neces-  
8 sary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands  
9 for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S.  
10 National Committee on Geology; and payment of compen-  
11 sation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological  
12 Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the  
13 United States in the negotiation and administration of inter-  
14 state compacts.

## 15 BUREAU OF MINES

### 16 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

#### 17 RESOURCES

18 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,  
19 exploration, development, production, and utilization of min-  
20 eral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Terri-  
21 tories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and sub-  
22 stitutes; \$31,540,000.



## HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law; \$9,390,000.

## SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary of the Interior under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## APPALACHIAN REGION MINING AREA RESTORATION

For expenses necessary in carrying out a nationwide study of strip and surface mine rehabilitation and reclamation, and a program of mining area restoration, as authorized by section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, \$8,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purchase, or for sharing in the cost of purchase, of lands or interests therein.

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines; \$1,556,000.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed

1 seventy-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement  
2 only; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies  
3 in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Pro-*  
4 *vided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands,  
5 buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public  
6 and private sources and to prosecute projects in coopera-  
7 tion with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Pro-*  
8 *vided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized,  
9 during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through  
10 any Government agency, including corporations, any metal  
11 or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants  
12 operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such  
13 sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous  
14 receipts.

# HELIUM FUND

16       The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treas-  
17   ury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant  
18   to section 12 (a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960  
19   to carry out the provisions of the Act and contractual obliga-  
20   tions thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain  
21   available without fiscal year limitation, \$26,000,000, in  
22   addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.



## OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), \$8,220,000 to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$367,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

## OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, \$722,000.

## BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products;

1 collection, compilation, and publication of information con-  
2 cerning such resources; promotion of education and training  
3 of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions  
4 related thereto, as authorized by law; \$20,312,000, and in  
5 addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived from the Pribilof Islands  
6 fund.

7 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

8 (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

9 For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
10 Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
11 quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of  
12 the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as authorized by law,  
13 \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,  
14 That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to  
15 other appropriations to such agency, for payments in the  
16 foregoing currencies.

17 CONSTRUCTION

18 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
19 facilities required for the conservation, management, investi-  
20 gation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery  
21 resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein,  
22 \$1,245,000, to remain available until expended.



1                   CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

2           For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
3 the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by  
4 the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the  
5 construction of fishing vessels, \$3,000,000, to remain avail-  
6 able until expended.

7                   FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

8                   RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

9           For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the  
10 Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of  
11 1964 (78 Stat. 197), \$4,710,000, of which not to exceed  
12 \$210,000 shall be available for program administration and  
13 \$400,000 shall be available until expended pursuant to the  
14 provisions of section 4 (b) of the Act: *Provided*, That the  
15 sum of \$4,100,000 available for apportionment to the States  
16 pursuant to section 5 (a) of the Act shall remain available  
17 until the close of the fiscal year following the year for which  
18 appropriated.

19                   GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

20           For expenses necessary for general administration of  
21 the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses  
22 in the regional offices, \$739,000.

## 1                   ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

2       For carrying out the provisions of the Act of Febru-  
3   ary 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a-631q), there  
4   are appropriated amounts not to exceed \$2,468,000, to be  
5   derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

## 6       LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES

## 7                   LOAN FUND

8       During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$309,000 of  
9   the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative  
10  expenses.

## 11                   ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

12       Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
13  Commercial Fisheries shall be available for purchase of not to  
14  exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen  
15  shall be for replacement only (including one for police-type  
16  use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price  
17  limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of one re-  
18  placement aircraft; publication and distribution of bulletins  
19  as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commuta-  
20  tion of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not  
21  to exceed \$3 per man per day; options for the purchase of  
22  land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; and maintenance  
23  and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities  
24  under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries



1 to which the United States has title, and which are utilized  
2 pursuant to law in connection with management and in-  
3 vestigations of fishery resources.

4 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

5 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

6 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic  
7 studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection,  
8 and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except  
9 whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of  
10 other authorized functions related to such resources; opera-  
11 tion of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard  
12 National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770) ; and maintenance  
13 of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains  
14 Wildlife Refuge; \$37,164,000.

15 CONSTRUCTION

16 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
17 facilities required in the conservation, management, inves-  
18 tigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wild-  
19 life resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests  
20 therein, \$5,130,000, to remain available until expended:  
21 *Provided*, That the unobligated balance remaining on  
22 June 30, 1966, of the appropriation granted under this head  
23 in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies

1 Appropriation Act, 1966, shall remain available until  
2 expended.

3           MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

4       For an advance to the migratory bird conservation  
5 account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16  
6 U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), \$6,000,000, to remain available until  
7 expended.

8   APPALACHIAN REGION FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION  
9                               PROJECTS

10       For expenses necessary in carrying out a fish and wildlife  
11 restoration program, as authorized by section 205 of the Ap-  
12 palachian Regional Development Act of 1965, \$1,000,000,  
13 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this ap-  
14 propriation shall not be available for the purchase, or for  
15 sharing in the cost of purchase, of lands or interests therein.

16           GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

17       For expenses necessary for general administration of  
18 the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such  
19 expenses in the regional offices, \$1,549,000.

20           ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

21       Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
22 Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shall be available for purchase  
23 of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-three passenger  
24 motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirteen are for



1 replacement only (including sixty-three for police-type use  
2 which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price  
3 limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of not to  
4 exceed five aircraft, for replacement only; not to exceed  
5 \$50,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for  
6 information or evidence concerning violations of laws admin-  
7 istered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; publi-  
8 cation and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7  
9 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commutation of rations for officers  
10 and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$3 per man per  
11 day; insurance on official motor vehicles, aircraft and boats  
12 operated by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in  
13 foreign countries; repair of damage to public roads within  
14 and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the  
15 Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, options for the pur-  
16 chase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities  
17 incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas  
18 as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the  
19 maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings and other  
20 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Sport Fish-  
21 eries and Wildlife and to which the United States has title,  
22 and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with  
23 management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources,

## 1 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

## 2 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

3 For expenses necessary for the management and pro-  
4 tection of the areas and facilities administered by the Na-  
5 tional Park Service, including protection of lands in process  
6 of condemnation; plans, investigations, and studies of the  
7 recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail  
8 plans and working drawings) and archeological values in  
9 river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River  
10 Basin); and not to exceed \$88,000 for the Roosevelt  
11 Campobello International Park Commission, \$35,694,000.

## 12 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL

## 13 FACILITIES

14 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,  
15 and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road  
16 maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable  
17 basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities  
18 essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to  
19 law by the National Park Service, \$26,680,000.

## 20 CONSTRUCTION

21 For construction and improvement, without regard to  
22 the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451),  
23 of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; the repair



1 or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other  
2 facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood,  
3 or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason  
4 of the use of funds for such purposes; and the acquisition of  
5 water rights; \$22,894,000, to remain available until  
6 expended.

7 PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF  
8 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

9 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
10 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
11 203, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Pro-*  
12 *vided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be ex-  
13 pended for planning or construction on the following: Fort  
14 Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, and Great Falls  
15 Park, Virginia, except minor roads and trails; and Dainger-  
16 field Island Marina, Virginia, and extension of the George  
17 Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard  
18 Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County,  
19 Maryland.

20 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

21 For expenses necessary for general administration of the  
22 National Park Service, including such expenses in the re-  
23 gional offices, \$2,562,000.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and forty-one passenger motor vehicles of which one hundred and five shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed seventy-seven for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year.

## OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951-1958), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended, \$27,500,000, of which not to exceed \$1,445,000, shall be available for administration and coordination during the current fiscal year.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants for the production of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 1958a-1958g), \$2,351,000, of which not to exceed \$206,000 shall be available for administration.



1 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions  
 4 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat.  
 5 329), \$6,894,000, of which not to exceed \$431,000 shall  
 6 be available for administrative expenses.

7 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor,  
 10 \$4,650,000, and in addition, not to exceed \$152,000 may  
 11 be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from  
 12 other accounts available to the Department of the Interior:  
 13 *Provided*, That hereafter hearing officers appointed for  
 14 Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the  
 15 Administrative Procedures Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended.

16 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of  
 19 the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not  
 20 to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation  
 21 expenses, \$4,984,100.

22 GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

23 SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be  
 24 available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or

1 office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emer-  
2 gency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft,  
3 buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged  
4 or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable  
5 causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available  
6 under this authority until funds specifically made available  
7 to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have  
8 been exhausted.

9       SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure  
10 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-  
11 tion in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the  
12 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression  
13 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or  
14 threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of  
15 the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this  
16 title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the  
17 payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal  
18 year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for  
19 destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in con-  
20 nection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such  
21 reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently  
22 available at the time of receipt thereof.

23       SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be  
24 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and



1 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will con-  
2 tribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall  
3 be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity  
4 in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30,  
5 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for  
6 costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services  
7 rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
8 time such reimbursements are received.

9 SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of  
10 the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appro-  
11 priations Act, 1967, shall be available for services as  
12 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
13 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, in total  
14 amount not to exceed \$200,000; hire, maintenance and  
15 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; pur-  
16 chase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private  
17 residences in the field, when authorized under regulations  
18 approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when  
19 authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in  
20 societies or associations which issue publications to members  
21 only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who  
22 are not members.

23 SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department  
24 of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for

1 uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5  
2 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4-204).

3 TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

4 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

5 FOREST SERVICE

6 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

7 For expenses necessary for forest protection and utiliza-  
8 tion, as follows:

9 Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the  
10 Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the  
11 administration, improvement, development, and management  
12 of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and  
13 preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for  
14 liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal  
15 year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and  
16 other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal  
17 lands; \$172,821,000, of which \$5,000,000 for fighting and  
18 preventing forest fires and \$1,910,000 for insect and disease  
19 control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679  
20 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the extent necessary  
21 under the then existing conditions: *Provided*, That not more  
22 than \$2,480,000 of this appropriation may be used for acqui-  
23 sition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended  
24 (16 U.S.C. 513-519): *Provided further*, That funds appro-



1 priated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to  
 2 section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h),  
 3 may be advanced to this appropriation.

4 Forest research: For forest research at forest and range  
 5 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-  
 6 where, as authorized by law; \$34,955,000.

7 State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation  
 8 with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in for-  
 9 est tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands,  
 10 and in forest management and processing, and for advising  
 11 timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and  
 12 others in the application of forest management principles and  
 13 processing of forest products, as authorized by law; \$17,-  
 14 897,000.

15 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
 16 AUTHORIZATION)

17 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions  
 18 of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relat-  
 19 ing to the construction and maintenance of forest develop-  
 20 ment roads and trails, \$101,230,000, to remain available  
 21 until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pur-  
 22 suant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code,  
 23 section 203: *Provided*, That funds available under the Act

1 of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with  
2 and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further*,  
3 That not less than the amount made available under the  
4 provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended  
5 under the provisions of such Act.

6 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

7 SPECIAL ACTS

8 For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil  
9 erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior  
10 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance  
11 with the provisions of the following Acts, authorizing annual  
12 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not  
13 to exceed the following amounts from such receipts, Cache  
14 National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347),  
15 as amended, \$20,000; Uinta and Wasatch National Forests,  
16 Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended,  
17 \$20,000; Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada, Act of June 25,  
18 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), as amended, \$8,000; Sequoia Na-  
19 tional Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (54 Stat.  
20 402), \$32,000; in all, \$80,000: *Provided*, That no part of  
21 this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land  
22 which is not within the boundaries of the national forests  
23 and/or for the acquisition of any land without the approval  
24 of the local government concerned.



## 1 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

2 For the acquisition of land in the Uinta National Forest,  
3 Utah, in accordance with the Act of October 1, 1965 (79  
4 Stat. 899), \$300,000, to remain available until expended.

## 5 COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

6 For artificial revegetation, construction, and mainte-  
7 nance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradi-  
8 cation of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in  
9 accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16  
10 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized  
11 by said section, \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

## 12 ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

13 For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the  
14 Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16  
15 U.S.C. 568e), \$1,000,000, to remain available until  
16 expended.

## 17 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

18 Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current  
19 fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to  
20 exceed one hundred and sixty-five passenger motor  
21 vehicles of which one hundred and fifteen shall be for  
22 replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and  
23 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed

1 four for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant  
2 to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act  
3 of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 for  
4 employment under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
5 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as  
6 authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended  
7 (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of  
8 buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a);  
9 (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commis-  
10 sion as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911  
11 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests  
12 therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the  
13 Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

14 Except to provide materials required in or incident to  
15 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic  
16 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the  
17 Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine  
18 manufactured from commodities or materials produced out-  
19 side of the United States.

20 Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for



1 acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act  
2 approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519,  
3 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of an  
4 established national forest or purchase unit.

5 FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety  
8 Board of Review, including services as authorized by section  
9 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
10 \$61,400.

11 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing  
14 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including  
15 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and  
16 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Com-  
17 mittee meetings of the Commission either within or outside  
18 the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers ap-  
19 proved by the Commission, \$115,000.

## 1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## 2 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

## 3 INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

4 For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to  
5 carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68  
6 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed sixteen  
7 passenger motor vehicles, of which twelve shall be for  
8 replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and  
9 aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service  
10 in private residences in the field, when authorized under reg-  
11 ulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set  
12 forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at  
13 facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324,  
14 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; \$73,250,000.

## 15 CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

16 For construction, major repair, improvement, and equip-  
17 ment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quar-  
18 ters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and  
19 drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of port-  
20 able buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic  
21 and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized  
22 by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C.  
23 2004a); \$13,000,000, to remain available until expended:  
24 *Provided*, That such expenditures during the current or any



1 subsequent fiscal year may, at the option of the Department  
2 of Health, Education, and Welfare, be made by the Depart-  
3 ment of the Interior as contracting agent.

#### 4 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

##### 5 ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

6 For carrying out sections 12 and 13 of the National  
7 Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965,  
8 \$1,000,000.

##### 9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

10 Appropriations contained in this Act, available for  
11 salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as au-  
12 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
13 U.S.C. 55a).

14 Appropriations contained in this Act available for sal-  
15 aries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allow-  
16 ances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954,  
17 as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

18 Appropriations contained in this Act available for  
19 salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of at-  
20 tendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions  
21 or activities for which the appropriation is made or which  
22 will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or manage-  
23 ment of those functions or activities.

## 1 INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

## 2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
4 Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70) , creating an Indian  
5 Claims Commission, \$382,000, of which not to exceed  
6 \$10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

## 7 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## 8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National  
10 Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i) , includ-  
11 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of Au-  
12 gust 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and uniforms or allowances  
13 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ;  
14 \$1,005,000.

## 15 NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

## 16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
18 title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537) , includ-  
19 ing payment in advance for membership in societies whose  
20 publications or services are available to members only or to  
21 members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of  
22 passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances there-  
23 for, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$1,400,000.



## CONSTRUCTION, RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

For expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct, and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, including acquisition of rights of way, land and interests therein, \$9,055,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE  
HUMANITIES

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain available until expended, \$7,000,000, of which \$6,000,000 shall be available for carrying out sections 5 (c) and 5 (h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11 (b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10 (a) (2) of the Act, but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts, and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively

1 appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section  
2 11 (b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

3 PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Public Land Law Review  
6 Commission, established by Public Law 88-606, approved  
7 September 19, 1964, including services as authorized by  
8 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
9 and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representa-  
10 tion expenses, \$907,000, to remain available until expended.

11 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution,  
14 including research; preservation, exhibition, and increase of  
15 collections from Government and other sources; international  
16 exchanges; anthropological researches; maintenance of the  
17 Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observa-  
18 tions in high altitudes; administration of the National Col-  
19 lection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; in-  
20 cluding not to exceed \$35,000 for services as authorized  
21 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);  
22 purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and  
23 elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as  
24 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees;



1 repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and  
2 preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for  
3 publications; \$22,523,000.

4     **ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND EXCAVATION (SPECIAL**  
5                                 **FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)**

6         For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
7 Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
8 quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses for  
9 carrying out museum programs and related research in the  
10 natural sciences and cultural history under the provisions of  
11 section 104(k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
12 Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704k),  
13 \$2,316,000, to remain available until expended and to be  
14 available only to United States institutions: *Provided*, That  
15 this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other  
16 appropriations to Smithsonian Institution, for payments in  
17 the foregoing currencies.

18         **CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL**  
19                                 **ZOOLOGICAL PARK**

20         For necessary expenses of planning, construction, re-  
21 modeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the  
22 National Zoological Park, \$1,589,000, to remain available  
23 until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount

1 as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of  
2 Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81-84; 75 Stat. 779).

3 RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

4 For necessary expenses of restoration and renovation  
5 of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institu-  
6 tion, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22,  
7 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed \$10,000 for  
8 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
9 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$2,300,000, to remain available  
10 until expended.

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

12 For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery  
13 of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein,  
14 and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized  
15 by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended  
16 by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolu-  
17 tion 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as  
18 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
19 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment in advance when authorized by  
20 the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library,  
21 museum, and art associations or societies whose publications  
22 or services are available to members only, or to members  
23 at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair,



1 and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators  
2 and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as  
3 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; purchase, or rental of  
4 devices and services for protecting buildings and contents  
5 thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches,  
6 and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and  
7 repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by  
8 contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms,  
9 or organizations at such rates or prices and under such  
10 terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper;  
11 \$2,694,000.

12 CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
15 the Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366), as amended,  
16 \$25,000.

17 LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses of the Lewis and Clark Trail  
20 Commission, established by Public Law 88-630, approved  
21 October 6, 1964, including services as authorized by section  
22 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$25,000.

1     FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR  
2                                     ALASKA

3         For necessary expenses of the Federal Development  
4 Planning Committees for Alaska, established by Executive  
5 Order 11182 of October 2, 1964, including hire of passenger  
6 motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of  
7 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) , \$190,000.

8     FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

9         For necessary expenses of the Franklin Delano Roose-  
10 velt Memorial Commission, established by the Act of Au-  
11 gust 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694) , \$80,000, to remain available  
12 until expended.

13             GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

14         SEC. 202. The per diem rate paid from appropriations  
15 made available under this title for services as authorized by  
16 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) or  
17 other law, shall not exceed \$83.

18             TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

19         SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
20 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the  
21 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.



1        This Act may be cited as the “Department of the In-  
2    terior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967.”

Passed the House of Representatives April 6, 1966.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*

---

## AN ACT

---

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

---

APRIL 13, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations









# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued April 26, 1966  
For actions of April 25, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 68

### CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....9	Fibers.....28	Milk.....3
Adjournment.....5	Food prices.....11,12,18	Oils.....28
Agricultural	Foreign aid.....8	Participation sales.....7
appropriations.....6,15	Forest roads.....2	Public Law 480.....14
Appropriations...4,6,15,16	Forest Service.....4	Roads.....2
Child nutrition.....21	Hardwoods.....28	Ryukuy Islands.....8
Community development...1	Imports.....23	School milk.....3
Consumers.....22	Inflation.....10	Supplemental
Dairy products.....23	Information.....20	appropriations.....4,16
Daylight time.....27	Labeling.....22	Tariff.....28
Education.....19	Legislative program....15	Tobacco.....25
Farm labor.....12,17	Loan pools.....7	Water research.....26
Farm program.....3,11	Manpower.....24	
Federal aid.....19	Marketing.....25	

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Senate passed community development districts bill. House committees reported agricultural appropriation and participation sales bills. Sen. Moss requested forest roads-trails increase. Sen. Proxmire defended farmers and commended school-milk increase. Sen. Mondale inserted Grange letter defending Secretary Freeman. Rep. Albert reported state of Nation's agriculture good. House subcommittee voted to report diverted acreage allotment bill.

### SENATE

1. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS.** Passed, 43-21, with amendments S. 2934, authorizing grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. Agreed to a Lausche amendment to limit HUD grants to the present authorization. Agreed to an Ellender amendment to strike out the appropriation authorization. pp. 8474-88
2. **FOREST ROADS.** Sen. Moss offered and discussed an amendment to S. 3155, the road authorization bill, to increase forest roads and trails from \$85 million

to \$150 million for the fiscal year 1968 and from \$110 million to \$150 million for the fiscal year 1969. p. 8449

3. FARM PROGRAM; SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire defended farmers, inserted an article on this subject, and praised the Whitten subcommittee for increasing the school milk program. pp. 8455-7

Sen. Mondale commended recent accomplishments in increasing farm income and inserted a letter from the National Grange defending Secretary Freeman. pp. 8467-9

4. APPROPRIATIONS. On Apr. 22 an appropriations subcommittee marked up and approved for full committee consideration H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. p. D342

The Appropriations Committee ordered favorably reported with amendments H. R. 14012, second supplemental appropriation bill, which may be debated Apr. 27. p. D342

5. ADJOURNED until Wed., Apr. 27. p. 8491

#### HOUSE

6. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967. On April 22, during adjournment, the Appropriations Committee reported this bill, H. R. 14596 (H. Rept. 1446) (p. 8439). Attached to this Digest is a copy of the committee report, which includes a summary table reflecting committee action on the bill.

7. LOANS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendments H. R. 14544, the proposed Participation Sales Act of 1966 (H. Rept. 1448), and S. 2499, to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain loan pools held by the Small Business Administration (H. Rept. 1447). p. 8439

Rep. Talcott stated the participation sales bill is being "rammed through the committee and the Congress before even Members of Congress can understand it or evaluate the consequences." pp. 8389-90

8. FOREIGN AID. Passed without amendment H. R. 12617, to increase from \$12 million to \$25 million the amount authorized to be appropriated in any fiscal year for obligation and expenditure in accordance with programs approved by the President for certain activities within the Ryukyu Islands. pp. 8379-86

9. ACREAGE ALLOTMENT. A subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee action H. R. 13057, amended, to amend the provisions of law relating to the planting of crops on acreage diverted under the cotton, wheat, and feed grains program. p. D344

10. INFLATION. Rep. Pelly spoke in favor of "a modest reduction in Government non-defense expenditures" to curb inflation rather than an income tax increase and urged such consideration on pending appropriation bills. p. 8378

11. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Albert stated that the state of our Nation's agriculture is good and inserted articles defending the President and Secretary Freeman against accusations of placing the blame for "high food prices on farmers." pp. 8396-7



# CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Langen, Odin, *Minn.*-----  
 Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*-----  
 Leggett, Robert L., *Calif.*-----  
 Lennon, Alton, *N.C.*-----  
 Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*-----  
 Long, Clarence D., *Md.*-----  
 Long, Speedy O., *La.*-----  
 Love, Rodney M., *Ohio*-----  
 McCarthy, Richard D., *N.Y.*-----  
 McClory, Robert, *Ill.*-----321 Constitution Ave. NE.  
 McCormack, John W., *Mass.*-----The Washington  
 McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*-----4000 Mass. Ave.  
 McDade, Joseph M., *Pa.*-----  
 McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*-----  
 McEwen, Robert C., *N.Y.*-----  
 McFall, John J., *Calif.*-----1404 Trinity Dr.,  
 Alexandria, Va.  
 McGrath, Thomas C., Jr., *N.J.*-----  
 McMillan, John L., *S.C.*-----  
 McVicker, Roy H., *Colo.*-----  
 Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*-----  
 MacGregor, Clark, *Minn.*-----  
 Machen, Hervey G., *Md.*-----  
 Mackay, James A., *Ga.*-----110 Maryland Ave.  
 NE., Apt. 508  
 Mackie, John C., *Mich.*-----  
 Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*-----  
 Mahon, George H., *Tex.*-----1200 N. Nash St.,  
 Arlington, Va.  
 Malliard, William S., *Calif.*-----  
 Marsh, John O., Jr., *Va.*-----  
 Martin, Dave, *Nebr.*-----  
 Martin, James D., *Ala.*-----  
 Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*-----Sheraton-Park  
 Mathias, Charles McC., Jr., *Md.*-----  
 Matsunaga, Spark M., *Hawaii.*-----  
 Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*-----  
 May, Catherine, *Wash.*-----  
 Meeds, Lloyd, *Wash.*-----  
 Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*-----  
 Miller, George P., *Calif.*-----  
 Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*-----2701 Conn. Ave.  
 Minish, Joseph G., *N.J.*-----  
 Mink, Patsy T., *Hawaii.*-----  
 Minshall, William E., *Ohio*-----8120 Kerry Lane,  
 Chevy Chase, Md.  
 Mize, Chester L., *Kans.*-----  
 Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio*-----  
 Monagan, John S., *Conn.*-----  
 Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*-----  
 Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*-----  
 Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*-----  
 Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*-----  
 Morrison, James H., *La.*-----2500 Que St.  
 Morse, F. Bradford, *Mass.*-----  
 Morton, Rogers C. B., *Md.*-----  
 Mosher, Charles A., *Ohio*-----4246 Warren St.  
 Moss, John E., *Calif.*-----715 S. Royal St.,  
 Alexandria, Va.  
 Multer, Abraham J., *N.Y.*-----  
 Murphy, John M., *N.Y.*-----  
 Murphy, William T., *Ill.*-----  
 Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*-----  
 Natcher, William H., *Ky.*-----  
 Nedzi, Lucien N., *Mich.*-----  
 Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*-----  
 Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*-----  
 O'Brien, Leo W., *N.Y.*-----  
 O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*-----The Congressional  
 O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*-----  
 O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*-----  
 Olsen, Arnold, *Mont.*-----4244 50th St.  
 Olson, Alec G., *Minn.*-----  
 O'Neal, Maston, *Ga.*-----  
 O'Neill, Thos P., Jr., *Mass.*-----  
 Ottlinger, Richard L., *N.Y.*-----  
 Passman, Otto E., *La.*-----  
 Patman, Wright, *Tex.*-----301 G St. SW.  
 Patten, Edward J., *N.J.*-----  
 Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*-----  
 Pepper, Claude, *Fla.*-----  
 Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*-----  
 Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*-----  
 Pickle, J. J., *Tex.*-----  
 Pike, Otis G., *N.Y.*-----  
 Pirnie, Alexander, *N.Y.*-----  
 Poage, W. R., *Tex.*-----228 2d St. SE.

Poff, Richard H., *Va.*-----  
 Pool, Joe R., *Tex.*-----  
 Powell, Adam C., *N.Y.*-----  
 Price, Melvin, *Ill.*-----  
 Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*-----  
 Purcell, Graham, *Tex.*-----9026 Old Mt. Ver-  
 non Rd.,  
 Alexandria, Va.  
 Quile, Albert H., *Minn.*-----  
 Quillen, James H. (Jimmy), *Tenn.*-----  
 Race, John A., *Wis.*-----  
 Randall, Wm. J., *Mo.*-----  
 Redlin, Roland, *N. Dak.*-----  
 Rees, Thomas M., *Calif.*-----  
 Reid, Charlotte T., *Ill.*-----  
 Reid, Ogden R., *N.Y.*-----  
 Reifel, Ben, *S. Dak.*-----  
 Reinecke, Ed, *Calif.*-----  
 Resnick, Joseph Y., *N.Y.*-----  
 Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*-----  
 Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*-----3508 Silver Park  
 Dr., Apt. 7, Wash-  
 ington 23, D.C.  
 Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*-----  
 Rivers, L. Mendel, *S.C.*-----  
 Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska*-----  
 Roberts, Ray, *Tex.*-----224 Emerald Hill  
 Dr., Tantalion,  
 Wash. 22, D.C.  
 Robison, Howard W., *N.Y.*-----3903 Franklin St.,  
 Kensington, Md.  
 Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N.J.*-----  
 Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*-----  
 Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*-----4200 Cathedral  
 Ave., Apt. 212A  
 Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*-----  
 Roman, Daniel J., *Ill.*-----  
 Roncalio, Teno, *Wyo.*-----  
 Rooney, Fred B., *Pa.*-----  
 Rooney, John J., *N.Y.*-----  
 Rosenthal, Benjamin S., *N.Y.*-----  
 Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*-----  
 Roudebush, Richard L., *Ind.*-----  
 Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*-----  
 Roybal, Edward R., *Calif.*-----  
 Rumsfeld, Donald, *Ill.*-----  
 Ryan, William F., *N.Y.*-----  
 Satterfield, David E., *Ill.*-----  
 Va.  
 St. Germain, Fernand J., *R.I.*-----  
 St. Onge, William L., *Conn.*-----  
 Saylor, John P., *Pa.*-----  
 Scheuer, James H., *N.Y.*-----  
 Schisler, Gale, *Ill.*-----  
 Schmidhauser, John R., *Iowa*-----  
 Schneebell, Herman T., *Pa.*-----  
 Schweiker, Richard S., *Pa.*-----  
 Scott, Ralph J., *N.C.*-----  
 Secrest, Robert T., *Ohio*-----  
 Seiden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*-----1213 Lily Dhu  
 Lane, Falls  
 Church, Va.  
 Senner, George F., Jr., *Ariz.*-----  
 Shipley, George E., *Ill.*-----  
 Shriver, Garner E., *Kans.*-----  
 Sickles, Carlton R., *Md.*-----  
 Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*-----  
 Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*-----129 6th St. NE.  
 Skubitz, Joe, *Kans.*-----  
 Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*-----800 4th St. SW.  
 Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*-----  
 Smith, Henry P., III, *N.Y.*-----3323 36th St.  
 Smith, Howard W., *Va.*-----204 W. Walnut St.,  
 Alexandria, Va.  
 Smith, Neal, *Iowa*-----  
 Springer, William L., *Ill.*-----  
 Stafford, Robert T., *Vt.*-----  
 Stagers, Harley O., *W. Va.*-----  
 Stalbaum, Lynn E., *Wis.*-----  
 Stanton, J. William, *Ohio*-----  
 Steed, Tom, *Okla.*-----  
 Stephens, Robert G., Jr., *Ga.*-----  
 Stratton, Samuel S., *N.Y.*-----  
 Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*-----  
 Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*-----  
 Sweeney, Robert E., *Ohio*-----  
 Talcott, Burt L., *Calif.*-----  
 Taylor, Roy A., *N.C.*-----  
 Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*-----  
 Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*-----6015 Mass. Ave.  
 Tenzer, Herbert, *N.Y.*-----

Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*-----3301 Mass. Ave.  
 Thomas, Lera (Mrs. Al-  
 bert), *Tex.*-----  
 Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N.J.*-----  
 Thomson, Vernon, W., *Wis.*-----  
 Todd, Paul H., Jr., *Mich.*-----  
 Toli, Herman, *Pa.*-----  
 Trimble, James W., *Ark.*-----  
 Tuck, William M., *Va.*-----  
 Tunney, John V., *Calif.*-----  
 Tupper, Stanley R., *Maine*-----  
 Tuten, J. Russell, *Ga.*-----  
 Udall, Morris K., *Ariz.*-----  
 Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*-----  
 Utt, James B., *Calif.*-----  
 Van Deerlin, Lionel, *Calif.*-----  
 Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio*-----  
 Vigorito, Joseph P., *Pa.*-----  
 Vivian, Weston E., *Mich.*-----  
 Waggoner, Joe D., Jr., *La.*-----  
 Walker, E. S. Johnny, *N. Mex.*-----  
 Walker, Prentiss, *Miss.*-----  
 Watkins, G. Robert, *Pa.*-----  
 Watson, Albert W., *S.C.*-----  
 Watts, John C., *Ky.*-----  
 Weltner, Charles L., *Ga.*-----  
 Whalley, J. Irving, *Pa.*-----  
 White, Compton I., *Idaho*-----1215 23d St. S.,  
 Arlington, Va.  
 White, Richard, *Tex.*-----  
 Whitener, Basil L., *N.C.*-----  
 Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*-----5804 Nebraska  
 Ave.  
 Wildnall, William B., *N.J.*-----  
 Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*-----1001 26th Rd. S.,  
 Arlington, Va.  
 Willis, Edwin E., *La.*-----  
 Wilson, Bob, *Calif.*-----  
 Wilson, Charles H., *Calif.*-----4801 Randolph  
 Dr., Annandale,  
 Va.  
 Wolff, Lester L., *N.Y.*-----Woodner Hotel  
 Wright, Jim, *Tex.*-----  
 Wyatt, Wendell, *Oreg.*-----1209 Huntly Pl.,  
 Alexandria, Va.  
 Wylder, John W., *N.Y.*-----  
 Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*-----  
 Young, John, *Tex.*-----  
 Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*-----4501 Conn. Ave.  
 Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*-----

## RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Polanco-Abreu, Santiago,  
 P.R.

## OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.  
 Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.  
 Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 3119 N. Har-  
 rison St., Arlington 7, Va.  
 Chaplain—(Vacancy)  
 Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

## OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

### SENATE

Charles J. Drescher (chief reporter), 3738  
 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.  
 Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.  
 Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr.,  
 Silver Spring, Md.  
 Jack Romagna, 9908 Indian Lane, Silver  
 Spring, Md.  
 Francis J. McSwiggan, 200 River Towers Dr.,  
 Alexandria, Va.  
 G. Russell Walker, 8603 Preston St., Hyatts-  
 ville, Md.  
 Grant Perry, 11406 Cherry Hill Rd., Apt. 105,  
 Beltsville, Md.  
 Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.  
 Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison  
 St., Arlington, Va.  
 Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Pl.,  
 Chillum, Md.

### HOUSE

Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.  
 Cleveland Tucker, 1 Athens Rd. Burke, Va.  
 Jack Rund, 2389 N. Quincy St., Arlington, Va.  
 Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St.,  
 Arlington, Va.  
 Joseph J. Sweeney, 101 G St. SW., Apt. A118.  
 Edna C. Moyer, 2400 Goodhope Rd. SE., Apt.  
 102.  
 B. J. Sigurdson (clerk), 1921 U Place SE.  
 James W. Lea (assistant clerk), Prince Fred-  
 erick, Calvert County, Md.  
 Edward White (assistant clerk), 2819 31st  
 St. SE.



# Daily Digest

## HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses received President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 (HEW).

Senate passed bill on rural poverty programs.

## Senate

### Chamber Action

*Routine Proceedings, pages 8442-8474*

**Bills Introduced:** Eight bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3268-3275. Page 8445

**Bill Reported:** Report was made as follows: S. 2950, fiscal 1967 authorizations for military procurement, with amendment (S. Rept. 1136). Page 8445

**President's Communication—Reorganization Plan No. 3 (HEW):** President transmitted his recommendations for Reorganization Plan No. 3, providing for reorganization of health functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—referred to Committee on Government Operations. Pages 8441-8442

**Stockpiling:** Senate passed without amendment and cleared for President H.R. 13369, authorizing disposal of molybdenum from the national stockpile. Pages 8442-8443

**Public Lands—Washington:** S. 2421, relinquishing to the State of Washington jurisdiction over the Fort Canby-Cape Disappointment area, was passed with committee amendments. Pages 8443-8444

**Rural Poverty:** By 43 yeas to 21 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendment S. 2934, to provide Federal grants for comprehensive planning for rural community development, after adopting committee amendment which had first been amended by adoption of Lausche amendment, making certain limitation on grants authorized to be made by Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and Ellender amendment to eliminate language authorizing appropriations to carry out the provisions of the bill. Pages 8474-8488

**Second Supplemental Appropriations:** It was ordered that when H.R. 14012, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1966, is reported by Committee on Appropriations, it be made the Senate's unfinished business. Page 8488

**Confirmations:** Numerous civilian nominations were confirmed. Pages 8499-8500

**Nominations:** The following nominations were received: William Howard Shaw, of Delaware, to be an

Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and numerous Diplomatic and Foreign Service, Air Force in the rank of general, and Marine Corps. Pages 8491-8499

**Record Vote:** One record vote was taken today. Page 8487

**Program for Wednesday:** Senate met at noon and adjourned at 3:34 p.m. until noon Wednesday, April 27, when it may consider H.R. 14012, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1966. Pages 8488, 8491

### Committee Meetings

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

#### COTTON PROMOTION

**Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:** Subcommittee on Agricultural Production, Marketing, and Stabilization of Prices held hearings on H.R. 12322, authorizing establishment of a program to promote the U.S. cotton industry. Witnesses heard were Clarence H. Girard, Consumer and Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture; Harry L. Graham, the National Grange; G. C. Cortright and William Rhea Blake, both of the National Cotton Council; E. Hervey Evans, Jr., Cotton Producers Institute of North Carolina, Laurinburg; Charles R. Sayre, Cotton Producers Institute of Mississippi, Greenwood; Bruce Lynn, Cotton Producers Institute of Louisiana, Gilliam; and D. W. Brooks, Cotton Producers Association, Atlanta.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

#### APPROPRIATIONS—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL

**Committee on Appropriations:** Committee, in executive session, marked up and ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 14012, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1966.

#### APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

**Committee on Appropriations:** On Friday, April 22, subcommittee, in executive session, marked up and approved for full committee consideration H.R. 14215, fiscal 1967 appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies.







# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
(FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 11, 1966  
For actions of May 10, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 77

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....11	Forest Service.....1	Patent system.....17
Agricultural waste.....30	Forestry.....25	Personnel.....19
Alaska.....34	Great Society.....26	Population.....29
Animal research.....32	Horses.....6,39	Poverty.....14
Appropriations.....1,12	Housing.....34	Research animals.....32
Atomic energy.....9	Inspection.....39	Retirement.....19
Budget.....31	Inter-American Development Bank.....18	School milk.....5
Commodity reserves.....7	Labeling.....8	Supplemental appropriations.....1
Conservation.....22	Latin America.....10	Tire safety.....17
Electrification.....38	Loan pools.....3,16,23	Tree farming.....25
Farm labor.....2	Loans.....3,16,23,34	Water pollution.....37
Farm prices.....4,33	Monetary system.....20	Water research.....27
Farm program.....13	Natural resources.....22	Wheat.....21
Fees and charges.....36	Packaging.....8	Wildlife.....35
Food.....7,30	Participation sales.....3,16,23	
Foreign aid.....28		
Foreign trade.....24		

**HIGHLIGHTS:** Both Houses agreed to conference report on supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee reported Interior appropriation bill, including Forest Service. Reps. Teague, Calif., and Dole criticized cost of Secretary Freeman's reply to protests against administration of farm program. Rep. Albert commended administration's farm program. Sen. Bass introduced and discussed bill to provide supplemental financing for REA programs.

## SENATE

1. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14012, the second supplemental appropriation bill. The House concurred in the Senate item of \$30,000,000 for the emergency credit revolving fund. For other USDA items see Digest 68. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 9693-701, 9722-4

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, which includes items for the Forest Service (S. Rept. 1154) (p. 9641). Sen. Mansfield said it is hoped to debate this bill Thurs., May 12 (p. 9701). Excerpts from the committee report and a table reflecting committee action are attached to this Digest.

2. FARM LABOR. Sen. Dominick objected to termination of the Mexican farm labor program, speaking from the standpoint of the welfare of Mexican laborers, and inserted an article, "Under the Lid in Mexico: Makings of an Explosion." pp. 9657-8
3. PARTICIPATION SALES. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized the participation sales program, claiming it would result in higher interest/<sup>cost</sup>and hide the true Government expenses. p. 9659
4. FARM PRICES. Sen. Proxmire said farm prices are not too high. pp. 9659-60  
Sen. Mundt claimed a revolt is resulting from recent administration statements on farm prices. pp. 9670-1  
Sen. Yarborough said the rise in food prices is not the fault of the farmers. pp. 9677-8
5. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire objected to limiting the school milk program to the needy and referred to the objections which were made to proposals that the medicare program be limited to the needy. p. 9660
6. HORSES. Sen. Tydings recommended legislation to prohibit interstate shipment of horses that have been abused for the purpose of altering their natural gait. pp. 9651-4
7. COMMODITY RESERVE. Sen. Pearson asked additional cosponsors for S. 3306, a commodity reserve bill. p. 9654
8. TRUTH IN PACKAGING. Sen. Proxmire spoke in favor of the truth-in-packaging bill. p. 9660
9. ATOMIC ENERGY. Passed without amendment H. R. 14732, to provide 1967 authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission. This bill will now be sent to the President. S. 3293, the companion bill, was indefinitely postponed.
10. LATIN AMERICA. Sen. Kennedy, N. Y., continued his speech on Latin American problems. pp. 9705-16
11. ADJOURNED until Thurs., May 12. p. 9719

#### HOUSE

12. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967. Passed, 296-82, with amendments this bill, H. R. 14921 (pp. 9724-60). This bill includes items for the Office of Emergency Planning, Office of Science and Technology, Presidential disaster relief, Appalachian Regional Commission, Civil Service Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Department of Housing and Urban Development, etc.
13. FARM PROGRAM. Reps. Teague, Calif., and Dole criticized the cost of telegrams sent by Secretary Freeman to 40 Members of Congress in answer to their protests of "the manner in which he is administering his Department's \$4 billion farm subsidy programs" (pp. 9720-1). Rep. Albert commended and inserted a copy of the Secretary's telegram stating that "it makes clear that at no time in the history of the United States has American agriculture done so well." pp. 9721-2



37. WATER POLLUTION. S. 3327 by Sen. Nelson, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to improve the programs under such act; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author pp. 9641-8
38. ELECTRIFICATION. S. 3337 by Sen. Bass, to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1966, as amended, to facilitate the extension and improvement of rural electric and telephone service, and to strengthen and stabilize rural electrification and telephone systems by supplementation of the existing sources of Federal financing as provided by titles I and II of the Rural Electrification Act, to furnish additional sources of capital funds; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author pp. 9717-9
39. HORSES; INSPECTION. S. 3338 by Sen. Tydings, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect horses shipped in interstate commerce to determine if such horses have been subjected to inhumane treatment for the purpose of affecting or altering their natural gait; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author pp. 9651-4

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS:

- May 11: Foreign aid authorizations, S. Foreign Relations and House Foreign Affairs.  
Water pollution bills, and road authorizations, S. Public Works.  
Various fish and wildlife conservation bills, H. Merchant Marine.
- May 12: Special milk program, S. Agriculture (Mehren to testify).

oOo



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Forest Service

	Estimated Available, 1966 <u>a/</u>	Budget Estimates, 1967	House Bill 1967	Senate Committee Bill 1967	Increase(+) or Decrease (-) Senate Comm. Bill compared with House Bill
ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS:					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management <u>b/</u>	\$164,152,000	\$172,856,000	\$172,821,000	\$174,521,000	\$1,700,000
Forest research	37,372,000	34,435,000	34,955,000	38,578,000	+3,623,000
State and private forestry cooperation	17,558,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	-
Total, Forest protection and utilization	219,082,000	225,188,000	225,673,000	230,996,000	+5,323,000
Forest roads and trails	102,136,000	102,530,000	101,230,000	101,230,000	-
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	-
Uinta National Forest	-	300,000	300,000	300,000	-
Cooperative range improvements	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	-
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	-
Timber development organization loans and technical assistance	-	500,000	-	-	-
Total, Annual appropriations	322,998,000	330,298,000	328,983,000	334,306,000	+5,323,000
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS (Primarily "Payments to States and Territories" and "Roads and Trails for States" payable from national forest receipts) <u>d/</u>	57,268,000	60,950,000	60,950,000	60,950,000	-

- a/ Includes proposed supplemental appropriations for pay act costs as reflected in House Doc. No. 383 and House Doc. No. 405.
- b/ Includes contingency funds to the extent necessary as follows: (1) \$5,000,000 for emergency fire fighting and (2) \$1,910,000 for insect and disease control.
- c/ Excludes proposed supplemental appropriation of \$7,500,000 for fighting forest fires.
- d/ In addition, prior year balances available.

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE  
INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - FOREST SERVICE

Forest Protection and Utilization

Forest land management . . . . The committee concurs with the House increases over the budget estimate of \$150,000 for improvements on Todd Lake and the Confederate Breastworks in the George Washington National Forest, Va.; \$200,000 for water recreation facilities on the Middle Fork, Anderson River, Ind.; \$50,000 for preplanning funds for reservoir construction on the Upper Big River project, Meramec River, Mo.; and \$50,000 for engineering and recreational planning on the Lusk Creek project, Shawnee National Forest, Ill. In addition, the committee recommends that \$85,000 contained in the budget estimate for planning funds of the Missoula Equipment Development Center be provided.

The committee proposes that the following increases over the budget estimates be approved:

Construction of a dam at the Trout Pond recreation area, George Washington National Forest, W. Va.	\$410,000
Construction of a visitor center, Mammoth Lakes, Calif., Inyo National Forest .....	421,000
Recreation development, Monroe Reservoir, Wayne Hoosier National Forest, Ind. ....	200,000
Recreation management, Boundary Waters Canoe Area .....	100,000
Additional recreational facilities, Lake Michigan Re- creation Area .....	180,000
Construction of a bathhouse, Lake Glendale, Shawnee National Forest, Ill. ....	105,000
Preparation of plans and specifications, headquarters building, Black Hills National Forest, Custer, S. Dak. ..	85,000
Elevator installation, Blanchard Springs Caverns, Ozark National Forest, Arkansas .....	114,000

Forest Research . . . . The recommendation of the committee provides for the allowances of the House of Representatives over the budget estimate as follows: construction of a forest hydrology laboratory at Oxford, Miss. (\$450,000); and planning of research facilities at seven locations (\$522,000).

The committee recommendation provides for the following amounts to be appropriated over the House allowance:

Beaver Creek project, Arizona watershed program .....	\$140,000
(\$50,000 for data collection and analysis; \$60,000 for extending analyses and evaluations of watershed treat- ment to other areas; and \$30,000 for additional studies of prescribed fire.)	
Additional staffing at the Forest Service laboratory, Morgan- town, W. Va. ....	250,000
(\$140,000 for wildlife habitat research and \$110,000 for forest engineering research.)	
Additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Alexandria, La. ....	50,000
Research on elk management .....	100,000
Additional recreation research, Boundary Waters Canoe Area ..	100,000



Additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Rapid City, S. Dak. ....	60,000
Additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Bottineau, N. Dak. ....	40,000
Alpine snow and avalanche control research .....	175,000
Additional staffing at the Southern Hardwood Laboratory, Stoneville, Miss. ....	250,000
Forest management research, Bend, Oreg. ....	100,000
Preparation of design and specifications, Forest Service Laboratories:	
Lincoln, Nebr. ....	28,000
Burlington, Vt. ....	40,000
Durham, N. H. ....	75,000
Moscow, Idaho ....	40,000
Duluth, Minn. ....	35,000
Construction of an addition to the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Athens, Ga. ....	1,000,000
Construction, Silviculture and Animal Problems Laboratory, Olympia, Wash. ....	450,000
Construction, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Carbondale, Ill. ....	690,000

The committee is impressed by the need for a wood chemistry building at the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis. This facility is essential to progress in the control of air and water pollution from pulp and paper manufacture. The committee urges the Forest Service to consider carefully the inclusion of funds for construction of this building in the fiscal year 1968 budget.

A proposal for a wilderness recreation research program at Missoula, Mont., was brought to the committee's attention. While the committee has a continuing interest in the development of wilderness area recreation, it asks that the Forest Service clarify what such a research program would embrace, its objectives, and proposed levels of funding.

Timber Development Organization Loans and Technical Assistance . . . . The committee does not recommend restoration of the language and the funds proposed for timber development organization loans and technical assistance. As of April 15, 1966, only a little more than \$59,000 had been expended of the \$1 million which was appropriated for this purpose in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965. It was testified at the hearings that the only expenditure which had been made at that time (March 4, 1966) was for a study to determine exactly what constitutes a timber development organization which it was indicated was needed in order that adequate judgments could be made as to the suitability and effectiveness of an application for a feasibility study of an area having potential prospects for successful operation of timber development organizations. After this study is completed and there develops a reasonable certainty that available funds will be exhausted, the committee will give consideration to a request for supplemental appropriations.

Land and Water Conservation Fund . . . . The recommendation of the committee will provide the amount of the budget estimate to be divided as follows:

\*

Forest Service, \$18,093,000: This is the amount of the budget estimate, \$13,170,000, less \$77,000 proposed for purchases in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area, plus \$5 million of the amount proposed for the Redwood National Park.



## INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

MAY 10, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. HAYDEN), from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

### R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 14215]

The Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes recommended:

Amount of budget estimates, 1967 <sup>1</sup> _____	\$1, 340, 260, 500
Bill as passed by the House_____	1, 295, 169, 500
Increases over House bill recommended by com- mittee_____	34, 535, 500
Total of bill as reported_____	1, 329, 755, 000
Appropriations, 1966_____	1, 274, 285, 070
Bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under budget estimates, 1967_____	10, 505, 500
Over appropriations, 1966_____	55, 409, 930

<sup>1</sup> Borrowing authorization (not included in totals):

Budget estimate, 1967_____	\$26, 000, 000
Appropriation, 1966_____	16, 000, 000
House allowance_____	26, 000, 000
Committee recommendation_____	26, 000, 000

## SUMMARY OF BILL

The committee considered budget estimates totaling \$1,340,260,500 (\$1,214,814,500 for definite appropriations and \$125,446,000 for indefinite appropriations of receipts) for the programs and activities for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior—exclusive of the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation—and the following related agencies:

Forest Service (Department of Agriculture).

Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

Commission of Fine Arts.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

Division of Indian Health, Public Health Service.

Arts and Humanities Educational Activities, Office of Education.

Indian Claims Commission.

National Capital Planning Commission.

National Capital Transportation Agency.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

Public Land Law Review Commission.

Smithsonian Institution.

National Gallery of Art.

Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

Lewis and Clark Trail Commission.

Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.

The committee recommends appropriations totaling \$1,329,755,000 (\$1,204,309,000 for definite appropriations and \$125,446,000 for indefinite appropriations of receipts) for the programs and activities of these agencies. The sum recommended by the committee is a decrease of \$10,505,500 under the budget estimates considered, an increase of \$34,585,500 over the sums included in the House bill, and an increase of \$55,469,930 over the sums appropriated for the current fiscal year.

## REPROGRAMING PROCEDURE

The committee is concerned that on occasion appropriated funds are applied to projects other than those for which a need was justified to the committees. The committee, therefore, reiterates the reprogramming procedure set forth in its reports No. 971, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, and No. 172, 89th Congress, 1st Session.

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$49,080,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	48,755,000
House allowance.....	48,755,000
Committee recommendation.....	48,970,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$48,970,000, which compares with the budget estimate and the House allowance of \$48,755,000, as indicated in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Realty and mineral leasing services:			
Title, lease, and records service.....	\$5, 166, 000	\$5, 166, 000	\$5, 166, 000
Records improvement.....	771, 000	771, 000	771, 000
Resource management, conservation and protection:			
Land classification and mineral examination.....	4, 473, 000	4, 473, 000	4, 538, 000
Range management.....	5, 389, 000	5, 389, 000	5, 504, 000
Forestry.....	6, 836, 000	6, 836, 000	6, 836, 000
Soil and watershed conservation.....	14, 777, 000	14, 777, 000	14, 777, 000
Fire protection.....	3, 437, 000	3, 437, 000	3, 437, 000
Cadastral survey:			
Alaska.....	1, 691, 000	1, 691, 000	1, 691, 000
Other States.....	3, 087, 000	3, 087, 000	3, 122, 000
Firefighting and rehabilitation.....	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000
General administration.....	2, 128, 000	2, 128, 000	2, 128, 000
Total.....	48, 755, 000	48, 755, 000	48, 970, 000

The increase of \$215,000 is for the following purposes:

Identification, evaluation, and survey of islands in Minnesota and Michigan—\$100,000.

Range management—\$115,000 (\$35,000 in Montana and \$80,000 in Oregon).

It is the desire of the committee that within the program for cadastral surveys in Alaska special attention be given to the conduct of smaller scale lot surveys on individual homesteads, native village townsite surveys, and native land allotment surveys.

#### CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$3, 150, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	2, 900, 000
House allowance.....	2, 900, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 062, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,062,000 which is \$162,000 over the House allowance and the budget estimate of \$2,900,000. The recommendation of the committee includes \$500,000 to complete construction of the Anchorage fire station; \$100,000 to investigate and design a fire control center in Boise and to be used jointly by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service; \$750,000 for construction of sanitation and protection facilities; and \$1,550,000 for the maintenance of buildings and roads.

The recommended increase of \$162,000 over the budget estimate is for construction of an office building for the Bureau of Land Management office in Malta, Mont. (\$100,000); as well as for development of the Fort Meade recreation complex on the Makotapi project in South Dakota (\$32,000), and for development of the Sage Creek Reservoir in Wyoming (\$30,000).



## PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

## (Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$2, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	2, 000, 000
House allowance.....	2, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	2, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2 million, the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance. The purpose of these funds is for liquidation of contracts for construction of roads on the public domain.

## OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

## (Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$16, 945, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	9, 750, 000
House allowance.....	9, 750, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 750, 000

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of 25 percent of the gross revenues from the revested Oregon and California grants land for construction and acquisition, forest development and protection, and operation and maintenance on the revested lands and on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon. It is estimated that the appropriation will amount to \$9,750,000 in fiscal year 1967

## RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

## (Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1, 346, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1, 448, 000
House allowance.....	1, 448, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 448, 000

The committee recommends an indefinite appropriation of \$1,448,000 derived from public lands and Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act lands grazing receipts for the construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements.

## BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

## EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$105, 846, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	115, 296, 000
House allowance.....	114, 475, 000
Committee recommendation.....	115, 061, 300

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$115,061,300 for education and welfare services. This is \$586,300 over the House allowance and \$234,700 under the budget estimate. The recommendation of the committee is summarized in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Educational assistance, facilities, and services.....	\$83,309,000	\$82,709,000	\$82,909,000
Welfare and guidance services.....	13,909,000	13,899,000	13,899,000
Relocation and adult vocational training.....	15,184,000	14,973,000	14,973,000
Maintaining law and order.....	2,894,000	2,894,000	3,280,300
Total.....	115,296,000	114,475,000	115,061,300

The committee has increased by \$200,000 the amount allowed by the House of Representatives for the higher education program, and recommends that the amount for maintaining law and order be increased by \$386,300. This amount is to be distributed as follows:

\$72,000 to be used on the Fort Apache Indian Reservation, Ariz.

\$177,000 to be applied to the several Indian Reservations in Montana

\$122,000 for the benefit of the Oglala Sioux Tribe, South Dakota.

\$15,300 for employment of a probation officer for the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, N. Dak.

#### RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$42,796,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	44,611,000
House allowance.....	44,086,000
Committee recommendation.....	44,086,000

The committee concurs with the amount recommended by the House of Representatives for "Resources management," \$44,086,000. This is \$625,000 less than the budget estimate. The committee directs, however, that of the amount recommended, the agricultural extension program be funded at \$1,767,000, the same amount as was available in fiscal year 1966; and that housing development be funded at \$1,209,000. This action will replace in the agricultural extension activity that amount which was proposed to be taken from it and added to the housing development program.

The budget estimates, the House allowances, and the committee recommendations for the various activities are as follows:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Forest and range lands.....	\$5,259,000	\$5,224,000	\$5,224,000
Fire suppression.....	140,000	140,000	140,000
Agricultural and industrial assistance.....	7,636,000	7,592,000	7,592,000
Soil and moisture conservation.....	5,283,000	5,248,000	5,248,000
Maintenance of roads.....	3,891,000	3,887,000	3,887,000
Development of Indian arts and crafts.....	374,000	374,000	374,000
Management of Indian trust property.....	6,829,000	6,780,000	6,780,000
Repair and maintenance of buildings and utilities.....	13,988,000	13,631,000	13,631,000
Operation, repair, and maintenance of Indian irrigation systems.....	1,211,000	1,210,000	1,210,000
Total.....	44,611,000	44,086,000	44,086,000

## CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$35, 151, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	57, 164, 000
House allowance.....	55, 325, 000
Committee recommendation.....	56, 848, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$56,848,000, which is \$1,523,000 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives and \$316,000 under the amount of the budget estimate.

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in disallowing \$129,000 budgeted for fallout shelters. However, the committee believes that all of the construction program approved for the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be funded. For this reason, the committee agrees with the House appropriation of unbudgeted funds in the amounts of \$100,000 for planning and designing a high school at Sisseton, S.D.; \$25,000 for planning an elementary school at Peever, S.D.; and \$165,000 to continue construction of the Black Lake Dam, Mont. As explained in the following paragraphs, the committee recommends concurrence with the House disallowance of \$2 million of the budget estimate.

Reports received by the committee from the Bureau of Indian Affairs indicate that use of funds heretofore provided for construction of buildings and utilities generally has not produced any savings. As a matter of fact, there have been small overruns on a number of projects.

However, three large school projects funded in fiscal year 1965 had not even been started as of March 31, 1966. These are the Huerfano School, for which construction bids will be opened on June 8, 1966, and the Red Rock and the Sanostee Schools which, for a number of reasons have been combined into one school. A construction award was made on the latter on April 18, 1966, at over \$900,000 less than the combined estimates for the two schools. The committee recommends that the budget estimate be reduced by \$800,000 of this excess leaving the remainder for engineering, supervision, and contingencies. In addition, the committee does not recommend appropriation of the following funds included in the budget estimate:

John F. Kennedy Public School.....	\$444, 000
Advance planning, Navajo high schools.....	700, 000
Quarters.....	56, 000

The committee also recommends an appropriation of \$280,000 to provide for additional canal and lateral construction and lining on the Colorado River Indian irrigation project in Arizona; \$325,000 for construction of kitchen-dining facilities at the Flandreau Indian School, South Dakota; \$468,000 for construction of high school facilities at Maddock, N. Dak.; and \$450,000 for construction of junior high and high school facilities at Tularosa, N. Mex.

Within the amount provided for advance planning, the Bureau of Indian Affairs is directed to prepare plans for construction of a dormitory at Fairbanks, Alaska, for native high school students.

The committee directs that in cases where water is a factor in location of a school construction funds are not to be requested until a site with an adequate water supply is found. Funds are provided annually under this heading for water exploration.

The committee urges the Department of the Interior to study the desirability of Federal financial assistance to public school districts for construction of public school facilities to serve Indian children; and if such assistance is determined to be desirable, to propose legisla-



tion to the Congress to authorize the assistance. A report on this matter will be made to the committee by January 15, 1967.

The committee feels that some thought should be given at this time to those children who are not now served by existing school facilities, particularly in Alaska. Regional high schools and boarding facilities or their equivalent would at least be a partial answer to the problem of keeping children in school and upgrading their general education and their economic efficiency.

#### ROAD CONSTRUCTION

##### (Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$17, 445, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	16, 754, 000
House allowance.....	16, 754, 000
Committee recommendation.....	16, 889, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$16,889,000 to meet the contract liquidation obligations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in fiscal year 1967. In addition to the budgeted program this will provide \$135,000 for grading and surfacing the road between Grass Mountain and St. Francis on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$4, 520, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	4, 677, 000
House allowance.....	4, 623, 000
Committee recommendation.....	4, 623, 000

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in allowing \$4,623,000 for general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the coming fiscal year. This is \$54,000 less than the budget estimate.

#### TRIBAL FUNDS

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$3, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	3, 000, 000
House allowance.....	3, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3 million, the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance, for tribal funds in the coming fiscal year. The committee also recommends deletion of the prohibition against the use of tribal funds to purchase land or water rights in Wyoming if such acquisition would result in the purchases being exempt from local taxation.

#### BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$3, 398, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	3, 910, 000
House allowance.....	3, 910, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 960, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3,960,000 for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. This is \$50,000 greater than the House allowance and the budget estimate. The increase is for the purpose of surveying recreational opportunities and recommending development of the Missouri River area between Yankton, S. Dak., and Fort Benton, Mont.

## LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$125, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967-----	110, 000, 000
House allowance-----	110, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	110, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$110 million for the land and water conservation fund, the amount of the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. The distribution of this amount is indicated in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
1. Assistance to States-----	\$64, 440, 000	\$76, 203, 000	\$65, 703, 000
2. Federal land acquisition program:			
National Park Service: Requirements for recently authorized areas:			
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, Pa. and N.J.-----	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	6, 339, 500
Piscataway Park, Md.-----	544, 500		
Fire Island National Seashore, N.Y.-----	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	3, 000, 000
Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, Calif.-----	1, 425, 000	1, 425, 000	1, 425, 000
Assateague Island National Seashore, Md.-----	3, 360, 000	3, 360, 000	3, 860, 000
Cape Cod National Seashore, Mass.-----	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000
Minuteman National Historical Park, Mass.-----			500, 000
Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho-----	440, 000	440, 000	440, 000
Hubbell Trading Post National Historic Site, Ariz.-----	312, 500	312, 500	312, 500
Great Falls (George Washington Memorial Parkway), Va.-----	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site, Iowa-----	630, 000	630, 000	630, 000
Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr.-----	231, 200	231, 200	231, 200
Ozark National Scenic Riverways, Mo.-----	400, 000	400, 000	400, 000
Lake Mead National Recreation Area, Ariz.-----	142, 000	142, 000	142, 000
Canyonlands National Park, Utah-----	14, 500	14, 500	14, 500
Fort Scott National Historic Site, Kans.-----		200, 000	200, 000
Subtotal, new areas-----	15, 499, 700	15, 155, 200	19, 494, 700
Redwood National Park, Calif.-----	10, 000, 000		
Everglades National Park Florida-----			500, 000
Inholdings in park areas-----	2, 816, 300	2, 816, 300	3, 476, 800
Total, National Park Service-----	28, 316, 000	17, 971, 500	23, 471, 500
Forest Service:			
Wilderness areas-----	432, 050	355, 050	355, 050
Primitive areas-----	26, 200	26, 200	26, 200
Whiskeytown National Recreation Area, Calif.-----			250, 000
Other recreation areas-----	12, 711, 750	12, 711, 750	17, 461, 750
Total, Forest Service-----	13, 170, 000	13, 093, 000	18, 093, 000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife:			
Endangered species: Florida Sandhill crane-----	1, 335, 000		
Recreation areas-----	179, 000	172, 500	172, 500
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife-----	1, 514, 000	172, 500	172, 500
Total, Federal program-----	43, 000, 000	31, 237, 000	41, 237, 000
3. Administrative expenses-----	2, 560, 000	2, 560, 000	2, 560, 000
Total, 1967-----	110, 000, 000	110, 000, 000	110, 000, 000

The recommendation of the committee will provide the amount of the budget estimate to be divided as follows:

Assistance to States, \$65,703,000: This is the amount of the budget estimate, \$64,440,000, plus \$344,500 of the amount proposed for purchase of lands for Piscataway Park, Md.; \$77,000 proposed for purchases in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area, Idaho; \$835,000 of the amount proposed for purchase of a refuge for Florida Sandhill cranes and \$6,500 proposed for purchase of the Willapa tract, Washington.

National Park Service, \$23,471,500: This is the amount of the budget estimate, \$28,316,000, less \$5 million of the amount proposed for the Redwood National Park, and less \$344,500 proposed for Piscataway Park purchases, plus \$500,000 of the amount proposed for purchase of a refuge for Florida Sandhill cranes. Of the amount for the National Park Service, \$200,000 is for the Fort Scott National Historic site in Kansas.

For the past six fiscal years this committee has recommended the following amounts for land acquisition for the Everglades National Park, Florida: 1961—\$450,000; 1962—\$450,000; 1963—\$500,000; 1964—\$500,000; 1965—\$500,000; and 1966—\$1,125,000. The committee again proposes that funds in the amount of \$500,000 be provided for such land purchases in fiscal year 1967. There is an authorization of \$2,000,000 to purchase lands for this Park to carry out Public Law 85-482. The State of Florida has contributed \$2,000,000 which has gone toward the purchase of almost 1,300,000 acres of land for the Park.

Forest Service, \$18,093,000: This is the amount of the budget estimate, \$13,170,000, less \$77,000 proposed for purchases in the Selway-Bitterroot Wilderness Area, plus \$5 million of the amount proposed for the Redwood National Park.

Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, \$172,500: This is the amount of the budget estimate, \$1,514,000, less \$1,335,000 which had been proposed for purchase of a refuge for the Florida Sandhill cranes, and \$6,500 proposed for purchase of the Willapa Tract, Washington.

The distribution of the amount in the budget estimate for the Redwood National Park recommended by the committee for allocation to the National Park Service and to the Forest Service is indicated in the following table:



*Land acquisition program, 1967 held in abeyance to provide for Redwood National Park*

State and management unit	Forest Service	National Park Service
Alabama National forests.....	\$19,000	-----
Arkansas:		
Ouachita National Forest.....	108,743	-----
Ozark National Forest.....	92,000	-----
Total, Arkansas.....	200,743	-----
Arizona: Tonto National Forest.....	680,000	-----
California: Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.....	250,000	-----
Georgia: National forests.....	447,700	-----
Idaho: Targhee National Forest.....	34,500	-----
Illinois: Shawnee National Forest.....	251,460	-----
Indiana: Hoosier National Forest.....	174,123	-----
Kentucky: Cumberland National Forest.....	241,500	-----
Maryland: Assateague Island National Seashore.....		500,000
Massachusetts: Minute Man National Historic Park.....		500,000
Michigan:		
Hiawatha National Forest.....	245,496	-----
Huron-Manistee National Forest.....	77,150	-----
Ottawa National Forest.....	3,600	-----
Total, Michigan.....	326,246	-----
Minnesota:		
Chippewa National Forest.....	52,500	-----
Superior National Forest.....	115,136	-----
Total, Minnesota.....	167,636	-----
Mississippi: National forests.....	99,500	-----
Missouri:		
Clark National Forest.....	148,925	-----
Mark Twain National Forest.....	527,293	-----
Total, Missouri.....	676,218	-----
New Jersey: Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.....		2,339,500
New York: Fire Island National Seashore.....		1,000,000
Ohio: Wayne National Forest.....	252,735	-----
Pennsylvania: Allegheny National Forest.....	357,500	-----
Tennessee: Cherokee National Forest.....	392,935	-----
Utah: Zion National Park.....		141,700
Virginia:		
Jefferson National Forest.....	66,340	-----
Mount Rogers National Recreation Area.....	45,180	-----
Total, Virginia.....	111,520	-----
Washington: Okanogan National Forest.....	23,000	-----
West Virginia:		
Monongahela.....	98,285	-----
Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area.....	195,399	-----
Total West Virginia.....	293,684	-----
Wyoming: Grand Teton National Park.....		581,800
Grand total, all States.....	5,000,000	5,000,000

Although last year's appropriation provided that almost three-quarters of the available amount be for assistance to the States, the basic legislation requires that only 60 percent of available funds be for State assistance. Because of the numerous purchases which have recently been authorized for Federal recreational facilities it appears desirable to the committee that the maximum amount possible be made available to accomplish these purchases. This is especially necessary, it is felt by the committee, in view of rapidly rising land prices. As of April 8 over \$78,500,000 available to the several States had not

been obligated, although a number of applications were in the processing stages. This amount will be available in the coming year, of course, as will the amount recommended for appropriation in this bill by the committee.

The committee concurs with the views of the House committee regarding administrative personnel of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, and agrees that much of the work covered by the administrative expenses item could be handled quite effectively by Bureau staff rather than by contract. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation should explore very carefully which course of action is in the best interests of the Government. It is the committee's thought that the Bureau should hire additional employees within the amount of funds made available in this act if that course of action should be deemed advisable.

### OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

#### ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$14, 579, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	10, 513, 000
House allowance.....	10, 513, 000
Committee recommendation.....	10, 513, 000

The committee concurs with the action of the House of Representatives in recommending the budget estimate of \$10,513,000 for administration of territories. The amount recommended will provide for the Washington staff of the Office of Territories, for the Office of Governor and the Government Comptroller of the Virgin Islands, for the Office of the Governor of Guam, for servicing Alaska public works loans, and includes \$9,149,000 for the government of Samoa, as well as \$608,000 for the rehabilitation program on the Island of Guam.

In addition to the amount approved for construction on Guam, there is available \$4,895,000 which has previously been made available for urban renewal projects but which has not yet been expended. The construction program for American Samoa amounts to \$4,126,940.

### TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$17, 344, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	17, 494, 000
House allowance.....	17, 494, 000
Committee recommendation.....	17, 494, 000

The committee recommends the same amount as the House allowance and the budget estimate, \$17,494,000, for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in the coming fiscal year. This is \$6,000 less than is authorized by Public Law 87-541.

### THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The committee approves the use of \$1,229,000 to be derived from revenues to be received by the Alaska Railroad for a capital improvement program.

## GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

## SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$71, 680, 870
Budget estimate, 1967-----	<sup>1</sup> 80, 520, 000
House allowance-----	72, 782, 000
Committee recommendation-----	80, 932, 000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$6,600,000, S. Doc. 86, Apr. 13, 1966. Not considered by the House.

The Senate committee recommends an appropriation of \$80,932,000 for conduct of surveys, investigations, and research by the Geological Survey. This is an amount \$412,000 over the budget estimate and \$8,150,000 over the allowance of the House of Representatives. The various allowances are indicated in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Topographic surveys and mapping-----	\$23, 086, 000	\$22, 686, 000	\$22, 686, 000
Geologic and mineral resources surveys and mapping-----	25, 243, 000	18, 793, 000	25, 243, 000
Minerals exploration-----	421, 000	421, 000	421, 000
Marine geology and hydrology-----	862, 000	862, 000	862, 000
Water resources investigations-----	23, 816, 000	23, 178, 000	24, 728, 000
Soil and moisture conservation-----	201, 000	201, 000	201, 000
Conservation of lands and minerals-----	4, 793, 000	4, 693, 000	4, 693, 000
General administration-----	2, 098, 000	1, 948, 000	2, 098, 000
Total-----	80, 520, 000	72, 782, 000	80, 932, 000

Of the amount recommended, \$6,600,000 is contained in a budget estimate transmitted to Congress after the House of Representatives had considered this appropriations bill. The additional estimate is for exploration and discovery programs relating to heavy metals in short supply in the United States.

The Senate committee recommends an increase of \$900,000 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives for matching State offerings for cooperative water investigations. This increase is composed of \$500,000 which was budgeted and not allowed by the House, and \$400,000 additional which the presentation to the committee indicates is necessary to match the funds to be available from State and municipal sources during fiscal year 1967. It is expected by the committee that at least \$50,000 of this amount will be made available by the Geological Survey to match State funds in order to commence a hydrologic survey of the Delmarva Peninsula.

An increase of \$650,000 over the budget estimate is recommended for expenditure by the Geological Survey in order that phreatophytic growth may be cleared from the Gila River, Ariz., project area so that the research program on phreatophyte control which has been carried on in that area for a number of years may be continued.

The committee directs that none of the funds provided for wilderness area mineral surveys under the heading "Geologic and Mineral Resource Surveys and Mapping" be expended for mineral surveys on units of the national park system or on national wildlife refuges and game ranges.



## BUREAU OF MINES

## CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$31, 891, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	<sup>1</sup> 35, 166, 000
House allowance.....	31, 540, 000
Committee recommendation.....	34, 940, 000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$3,700,000 in S. Doc. 86, Apr. 13, 1966; not considered by the House.

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$34,940,000 which is \$226,000 under the budget estimate and \$3,400,000 more than the amount allowed by the House of Representatives. The committee agrees with the recommendation of the Department of the Interior that the \$300,000 added by the House of Representatives for research on extinguishing smoldering fires in culm dumps in Pennsylvania be transferred to the solid waste disposal activity. The committee's recommendation also includes \$3,700,000 in a budget estimate transmitted to Congress after consideration of this bill by the House of Representatives. This amount is asked for the purpose of developing production technologies of heavy metals which are in short supply in the United States.

Distribution of the committee's recommendation is indicated in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Research:			
Coal.....	\$6, 290, 000	\$6, 590, 000	\$6, 290, 000
Petroleum.....	2, 125, 000	2, 125, 000	2, 125, 000
Oil shale.....	1, 309, 000	1, 309, 000	1, 309, 000
Metallurgy.....	10, 916, 000	10, 121, 000	10, 916, 000
Mining.....	4, 366, 000	3, 085, 000	4, 366, 000
Marine mineral mining.....	1, 493, 000	235, 000	1, 493, 000
Explosives.....	570, 000	570, 000	570, 000
Resource development:			
Statistics.....	1, 803, 000	1, 803, 000	1, 803, 000
Economic analyses.....	556, 000	240, 000	330, 000
Bituminous coal.....	893, 000	893, 000	893, 000
Anthracite.....	366, 000	366, 000	366, 000
Petroleum.....	592, 000	592, 000	592, 000
Minerals.....	3, 330, 000	3, 054, 000	3, 330, 000
International activities.....	557, 000	557, 000	557, 000
Total.....	35, 166, 000	31, 540, 000	34, 940, 000

Recognizing the potential of western coal research the committee feels that it would be beneficial to continue and to expand research in the utilization of extensive western coal deposits such as those in eastern Montana, utilizing, where possible, local or regional research institutions and organizations.

It is the desire of the committee that operation of the Bureau's Boulder City, Nevada, Metallurgical Laboratory be continued indefinitely. Should closure of the Laboratory again be proposed, the committee is to be notified at least one year in advance of the intended closing date. This will afford the committee ample opportunity again to examine the advisability of such an action.

## HEALTH AND SAFETY

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$9, 507, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	9, 390, 000
House allowance.....	9, 390, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 390, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$9,390,000 for health and safety activities in fiscal year 1967. This is the same amount as the budget estimate. The following table sets forth this recommendation by activities:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Inspections, investigations, and rescue work.....	\$7,253,000	\$7,253,000	\$7,253,000
Control of fires in coal deposits.....	203,000	203,000	203,000
Health and safety research.....	1,934,000	1,934,000	1,934,000
Total.....	9,390,000	9,390,000	9,390,000

#### SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1,400,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	4,335,000
House allowance.....	4,000,000
Committee recommendation.....	4,300,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,300,000 for solid waste disposal activities in the coming fiscal year. This amount is divided as follows: \$1,100,000—demonstration grants, including \$300,000 for work on culm dumps in Pennsylvania; \$200,000—problem appraisal; \$2,265,000—scrap metal demonstration plants; \$300,000—utilization of processed solid wastes; \$260,000—utilization of incinerator wastes; \$175,000—recovery of alumina from red muds.

#### APPALACHIAN REGION MINING AREA RESTORATION

Appropriation, 1966.....	None
Budget estimate, 1967.....	\$10,566,000
House allowance.....	8,000,000
Committee recommendation.....	7,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$7 million for implementation of section 205(a)(1) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act. This is \$1 million less than the House allowance and \$3,566,000 less than the budget estimate. The amount recommended, together with unobligated funds which have been available since enactment of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965 will provide \$12,793,000 for sealing and filling of voids in abandoned coal mines and for control of underground mine fires. The amount recommended by the committee will make available \$3,764,000 for strip and surface mine area restoration. Of the total amount appropriated for this purpose beginning with the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, only about \$350,000 had been obligated as of March 31, 1966. Until the States have submitted applications for restoration work on government-owned lands, the Bureau will be unable to obligate funds. Should it develop that a need grows for more than the amount made available by the committee, the Bureau may request a supplemental appropriation.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1,529,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1,556,000
House allowance.....	1,556,000
Committee recommendation.....	1,556,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,556,000, the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

#### HELIUM FUND

##### (Borrowing authorization)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$16, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	26, 000, 000
House allowance.....	26, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	26, 000, 000

The committee recommends that there be provided to the helium fund \$26 million in additional borrowing authority for operation of the helium program during fiscal year 1967. This is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

#### OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$7, 220, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	8, 237, 000
House allowance.....	8, 220, 000
Committee recommendation.....	8, 220, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$8,220,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Coal Research in fiscal year 1967. This is \$17,000 less than the budget estimate and the same as the allowance of the House of Representatives.

The committee urges the Secretary of the Interior carefully to consider possible sites in North Dakota, Washington, and West Virginia for location of the pilot plant necessary to continue the Spencer Chemical Co. low ash coal project.

#### OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$704, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	722, 000
House allowance.....	722, 000
Committee recommendation.....	722, 000

The committee recommendation for salaries and expenses, Office of Oil and Gas, is \$722 000, the same as the amount allowed by the House of Representatives and proposed in the budget estimate.

#### BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

##### MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$21, 838, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	<sup>1</sup> 21, 092, 000
House allowance.....	<sup>1</sup> 21, 312, 000
Committee recommendation.....	<sup>1</sup> 22, 076, 000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$1,000,000 by transfer from Pribilof Islands fund.



The committee recommends an appropriation of \$22,076,000 distributed as indicated in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Management.....	\$490,300	\$490,300	\$490,300
Marketing and technology.....	5,354,500	5,374,500	5,454,500
Research.....	11,346,800	11,546,800	12,230,800
Research on fish migration over dams.....	1,427,100	1,427,100	1,427,100
Fishing vessel mortgage insurance.....	44,300	44,300	44,300
Columbia River fishery facilities.....	2,429,000	2,429,000	2,429,000
Total.....	1 21,092,000	1 21,312,000	1 22,076,000

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$1,000,000 by transfer from Pribilof Islands fund.

The committee's recommendation, which includes an increase of \$1,914,000 in available Saltonstall-Kennedy funds as proposed in the budget estimate, provides the full amount of the budget estimate plus \$200,000 added by the House of Representatives for increased research on menhaden fish along the Atlantic coast, and \$20,000 added by the House of Representatives for staffing and operation of the Baltimore Fishery Market News Service office.

The committee also recommends the following additions to the budget estimate: research on Alaskan shrimp technology, \$80,000; tail water research and expansion of biological investigations on Missouri River reservoirs, \$90,000; expanded biological research, Great Lakes fisheries, \$195,000; expanded development, Pacific hake fishery program, \$100,000; and expanded investigation, disappearance of migrating fish, upper reaches of Columbia River Basin, \$299,000.

#### MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

##### (Special foreign currency program)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$300,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	200,000
House allowance.....	500,000
Committee recommendation.....	500,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$500,000, the same as the House allowance, for purchase of foreign currency to be used for conduct of research programs in foreign countries. This is \$300,000 more than the budget estimate. The additional \$300,000 is the equivalent U.S. currency amount contained in the "Excess foreign currency authorization" proposal for translation of Russian and Red Chinese fisheries literature.

#### EXCESS FOREIGN CURRENCY AUTHORIZATION

The committee does not recommend the language proposed<sup>1</sup> for use of excess foreign currencies in a total U.S. dollar amount of \$4,910,000. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has been advised by the chairman of this committee that—

section 507 of the Public Works Appropriation Act of 1966, \* \* \* provides that foreign currencies may be used by Federal agencies only when reimbursement therefor is made

to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned. This same provision has been carried in the appropriations bills for many years and clearly demonstrated the intent of Congress that these foreign currencies be made available only when a dollar appropriation has been made.

The chairman also stated that budget—

recommendations to use foreign currencies in the manner proposed in the budget without a dollar appropriation and without a dollar figure is unsound and will result in these requests being denied by the Congress although I am sure many of the programs are sound.

The chairman then suggested that supplemental budget estimates for dollar appropriations be prepared and be submitted to the Congress. These amounts, if approved, could then be credited to the accounts which generated them, such as that of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and would make necessary lesser requests for restoration of capital impairment.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1, 980, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	495, 000
House allowance.....	1, 245, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 245, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,245,000 for the construction program of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. This amount includes the construction of a new bridge and seawalls at the Beaufort, N.C., Biological Laboratory, \$160,000; and \$335,000 for Columbia River fishery facilities. These items were proposed in the budget estimate. In addition, the committee concurs with the increase of \$750,000 approved by the House of Representatives for construction of phase B of the Willamette Falls fishway.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$5, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	3, 300, 000
House allowance.....	3, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	3, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$3 million, the same as the House allowance and \$300,000 less than the budget estimate, for payment of subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels. Of this amount, \$340,000 is programed for administrative expenses. The reduction recommended will not be detrimental to the subsidy program in view of an unobligated balance of over \$6 million as of March 31, 1966, to which can be added \$2,660,000 contained in this recommendation.

#### FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$4, 800, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	3, 210, 000
House allowance.....	4, 710, 000
Committee recommendation.....	4, 710, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,710,000, the same as the House allowance and \$1,500,000 more than the budget estimate for implementing the Federal Aid for Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act during fiscal year 1967. Of this amount, \$4,100,000 is to be available under section 4(a) of the act which authorizes funds to stimulate research and development projects in the several States. This is a matching fund authorization under which the Federal Government may match as much as 75 percent of the cost of a project. For section 4(b) of the act providing fishery resources disaster aid, the committee recommends \$400,000. The remainder of the proposed appropriation, \$210,000, is for administration of the program.

#### ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

Appropriation, 1966.....	None
Budget estimate, 1967.....	None
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	\$2, 675, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,675,000 to carry out the provisions of Public Law 89-304 approved October 30, 1965. This legislation is aimed at conserving, developing, and enhancing the anadromous fishery resources within the several States and in the Great Lakes. Although no request was made by the Department of the Interior for these funds, the committee has received urgings from many States and from the fishing industry that funds be provided.

The act itself contains a limitation on appropriation of these funds until June 30, 1970, during which time not more than \$25 million can be made available for purposes of the act.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$674, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	739, 000
House allowance.....	739, 000
Committee recommendation.....	739, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$739,000 for the general administrative expenses of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. This is the same amount as the House allowance and the budget estimate.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$2, 454, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	2, 468, 000
House allowance.....	2, 468, 000
Committee recommendation.....	2, 468, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,468,000 for administration of the Pribilof Islands. This is the same amount as the budget estimate and the House allowance, and will provide for the natives of the Pribilof Islands, for necessary building maintenance and rehabilitation work, and for operation of the fur-seal activity.



## FISHERIES LOAN FUND

(Limitation on administrative expenses)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$309, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	309, 000
House allowance.....	309, 000
Committee recommendation.....	309, 000

The committee concurs with the House recommendation of \$309,000 as a limitation on administrative expenses for the Fisheries Loan Fund. This is the same amount as was recommended by the Department.

## BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$36, 134, 300
Budget estimate, 1967.....	37, 304, 000
House allowance.....	37, 164, 000
Committee recommendation.....	39, 161, 400

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$39,161,400, which is \$1,997,400 over the allowance of the House of Representatives, and \$1,857,400 over the budget estimate. The committee's recommendations are set forth by activity in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Fish hatcheries.....	\$7, 909, 000	\$7, 857, 000	\$8, 302, 300
Wildlife refuges.....	10, 455, 000	10, 396, 000	10, 468, 100
Soil and moisture conservation.....	712, 000	708, 000	710, 000
Management and enforcement.....	3, 406, 000	3, 389, 000	3, 397, 000
Fishery research.....	3, 359, 000	3, 335, 000	3, 747, 000
Wildlife research.....	5, 902, 000	5, 866, 000	6, 458, 000
Fishery services.....	1, 385, 000	1, 466, 000	1, 567, 000
Wildlife services.....	2, 541, 000	2, 521, 000	2, 881, 000
River basin studies.....	1, 423, 000	1, 414, 000	1, 419, 000
Pesticides registration.....	212, 000	212, 000	212, 000
Total.....	37, 304, 000	37, 164, 000	39, 161, 400

The committee has approved \$115,000 of the increased pay costs disallowed by the House of Representatives; and concurs with the House in its increases for establishment of cooperative fishery units at Auburn University, Alabama, and Humboldt College, California, (\$40,000 each); and for a \$10,000 increase in the annual funding of the cooperative fishery unit at the University of Massachusetts. The committee also agrees with the allowance of the House of Representatives for additional operating expenses at the following national fish hatcheries: Norfolk, Ark., \$50,000; Natchitoches, La., \$27,000; and Wytheville, Va., \$100,000.

In addition, the following increases over the budget estimate and the House allowances are recommended by the committee:

Operating and maintenance funds for these fish hatcheries which will permit a production at 100 percent of capacity: Lahonton, Nev. (\$59,900); Gavins Point, S. Dak. (\$13,800); McNenny, S. Dak. (\$17,400); Paint Bank, Va. (\$4,800); Wytheville, Va. (\$36,500); Valley City, N. Dak. (\$10,500); Garrison Dam, N. Dak. (\$17,000); and Norfolk, Ark. (\$62,400)	\$222, 300
Technical assistance, fishery management, Aberdeen Area, Bureau of Indian Affairs	16, 000
Staffing, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center	85, 000
Financing the following cooperative fishery units at a \$40,000 annual level: Montana State College, Colorado State University, Utah State University, and University of Missouri	40, 000
Additional operating funds, Piedmont Wildlife Refuge	43, 100
Establishment of a cooperative fishery unit, University of Washington	40, 000
Financing the following cooperative wildlife research units at a \$40,000 annual level: Missoula, Mont.; Fort Collins, Colo.; Auburn, Ala.; Logan, Utah; Moscow, Idaho; Amherst, Mass.; Orono, Maine; and Stillwater, Okla.	199, 000
Establishment of a cooperative wildlife research unit, Mississippi State University	40, 000
Predatory animal control (Wildlife Services)	350, 000
Studies on artificial fishing reefs	400, 000
Determination of suitable site for trout hatchery in Kentucky	20, 000
Research on control of Polynesian rats in Hawaii	250, 000

The committee approves the establishment of six new positions needed in connection with the endangered species program. It is the understanding of the committee that the salaries and costs of these positions can be borne by operating funds in the budget.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966	\$18, 299, 200
Budget estimate, 1967	3, 169, 000
House allowance	5, 130, 000
Committee recommendation	8, 341, 600

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$8,341,600 for construction of sport fish facilities, including fish hatcheries and fishery research, and wildlife facilities, including wildlife refuges and wildlife research. This is \$3,211,600 over the allowance of the House of Representatives and \$5,172,600 over the budget estimate.

The amount recommended includes the budgeted proposals of \$84,000 for engineering design and site preparation for an Eastern Fish Nutrition Laboratory; \$1,785,000 for development on 26 national wildlife refuges; \$200,000 for advance planning on national wildlife refuges; and \$1,100,000 for construction of a laboratory-office building, Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, Md.

In addition, the committee has approved the House allowances of \$198,000 for a Marine Game Fish Laboratory, Port Aransas, Tex.; \$157,000 for a Marine Game Fish Laboratory, Panama City, Fla.; \$155,000 for a Central States fisheries project; and \$1,274,000 for construction at various hatcheries throughout the United States. House additions in the amount of \$177,000 for increased operation funds at three hatcheries have been approved but have been placed in the management and investigations of resources appropriation.

The Senate committee recommends approval of the following construction not contained in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives:

Improvements, Williams Creek, Ariz., national fish hatchery-----	\$140, 000
Continued construction, Camp Cornelia, Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge, Ga-----	148, 600
Continued development, Lahonton, Nev., national fish hatchery----	363, 800
Increased development on Sand Lake (\$300,000) and Lake Andes (\$38,000) national wildlife refuges, South Dakota-----	338, 000
Completion of Valley City, N. Dak., national fish hatchery-----	281, 200
Improvement of access road to Interstate Highway 94, Northern States Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, N. Dak-----	16, 000
Construction, fish genetics laboratory, Beulah, Wyo-----	270, 000
Completion, Creston, Mont., national fish hatchery-----	254, 000
Development, New London, Minn., national fish hatchery-----	121, 000
Additional facilities, Ouray Wildlife Refuge, Utah-----	125, 000
Initiation of development, Eufaula, Ala., national wildlife refuge----	300, 000
Improvements, Dexter, N. Mex., national fish hatchery-----	131, 000
Continued development, Kooskia, Idaho, national fish hatchery-----	310, 000
Continued rehabilitation, Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Okla---	465, 000
Continued rehabilitation, Berlin, N.H., national fish hatchery-----	65, 000
Development of William L. Finley Wildlife Refuge, Oreg-----	60, 000

The attention of the committee was directed to the urgent need for improvement of the road within the Tewaukon National Wildlife Refuge, Cayuga, N. Dak. It is the desire of the committee that every effort be made to include funds for the necessary improvements in the budget for fiscal year 1968.

#### MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$7, 500, 000
Budget estimate, 1967-----	6, 000, 000
House allowance-----	6, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	6, 000, 000

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in its allowance of \$6 million for the migratory bird conservation account. This is the amount of the budget estimate. This appropriation, together with receipts available from Federal hunting stamps, will provide a total of \$11 million for the acquisition of needed waterfowl habitat. This amount will make it possible to acquire 180,000 acres during the coming fiscal year, either in fee or through easement.

#### APPALACHIAN REGION FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION PROJECTS

Appropriation 1966-----	None
Budget estimate, 1967-----	1, 350, 000
House allowance-----	1, 000, 000
Committee recommendation-----	500, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$500,000 for implementing section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965. This will permit the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to continue with its program of developing strip-mine restorations through earth movement and the construction of fishing lakes with the corollary benefit of providing recreational resources through enhancement of fishing opportunities. The amount recommended is \$500,000 less than the House allowance and \$850,000 less than the budget estimate.



The recommendation of the Senate committee is made with the knowledge that an unobligated balance of \$1,313,000 on March 13, 1966, will provide a total program of \$1,813,000 through June 30, 1967, which includes the \$100,000 of 1967 funds allowed by the House of Representatives for planning, and \$150,000 for administration.

The committee has noted the request made at the time of the hearing that it approve the suggestion that the States not be required to participate in planning of these restoration projects. The committee is not prepared to approve any procedure which is not in accord with existing legislation. It is noted that the Appalachian Regional Development Act requires that—

\* \* \* the Federal share of mining area restoration projects \* \* \* conducted on lands other than federally owned land shall not exceed 75 per centum of the total cost thereof.

#### ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

Appropriation, 1966.....	None
Budget estimate, 1967.....	None
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	\$2, 675, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,675,000 to carry out the provisions of Public Law 89-304, approved October 30, 1965. This legislation is aimed at conserving, developing, and enhancing the anadromous fishery resources within the several States and in the Great Lakes. Although no request was made by the Department of the Interior for these funds, the committee has received urgings from many States and from the fishing industry that funds be provided.

The act itself contains a limitation on appropriation of these funds until June 30, 1970, during which time not more than \$25 million can be made available for purposes of the act.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1, 458, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1, 564, 000
House allowance.....	1, 549, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 564, 000

For general administrative expenses the committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,564,000 the amount of the budget estimate and \$15,000 more than the allowance of the House. The increase over the House figure will permit automatic within-grade promotions.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

##### MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$32, 366, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	36, 177, 000
House allowance.....	35, 694, 000
Committee recommendation.....	36, 171, 600

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$36,171,600 which is \$477,600 over the amount approved by the House of Representatives, and \$5,400 under the amount of the budget estimate. The action of the committee provides the full amount of the budget

estimate for operation of new park areas and new facilities in existing park areas.

The following table compares the budget estimate, the House allowance, and the committee recommendation for each of the various activities:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Management of park and other areas.....	\$30,451,000	\$29,968,000	\$30,445,600
Forestry and fire control.....	1,708,000	1,708,000	1,708,000
Soil and moisture conservation.....	206,000	206,000	206,000
Park and recreation programs.....	3,260,000	3,260,000	3,260,000
Concessions management.....	552,000	552,000	552,000
Total.....	36,177,000	35,694,000	36,171,600

The committee believes that even though the Secretary of the Interior has included all national seashores in a recreational category, the purpose of the Cape Cod National Seashore should continue to be one of conservation as set forth in the legislation authorizing its establishment.

#### MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$24,660,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	27,022,000
House allowance.....	26,680,000
Committee recommendation.....	26,680,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$26,680,000. This is the same as the House allowance and \$342,000 less than the budget estimate.

#### CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$26,177,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	23,500,000
House allowance.....	22,894,000
Committee recommendation.....	23,494,000

It is the committee's recommendation that \$23,494,000 be appropriated for National Park Service construction. This is \$6,000 less than the budget estimate and \$600,000 greater than the House allowance. The increase over the House allowance is to permit the National Park Service to construct both planned units of the Interpreter Training Center at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park at one time rather than dividing the construction between 2 fiscal years.

#### PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION

(Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$33,000,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	30,000,000
House allowance.....	30,000,000
Committee recommendation.....	30,000,000

The committee concurs with the allowance of the House of Representatives of \$30 million, the amount of the budget estimate, for liquidating obligations incurred under the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$2, 465, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	2, 562, 100
House allowance.....	2, 562, 000
Committee recommendation.....	2, 562, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,562,000, the amount of the House allowance and \$100 less than the budget estimate, for general administrative expenses of the National Park Service.

## OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$20, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	28, 595, 000
House allowance.....	27, 500, 000
Committee recommendation.....	27, 500, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$27,500,000 for salaries and expenses of the Office of Saline Water in fiscal year 1967. This is the same as the allowance of the House of Representatives and is \$1,095,000 less than the budget estimate.

As of March 31, 1966, the Office of Saline Water had an unobligated balance of \$12,618,915 which together with \$26,055,000 included in the current recommendation of the committee will provide a program between April 1, 1966, and the end of fiscal year 1967 of \$38,673,915. It is the opinion of the committee that an allowance of \$1,445,000 will provide adequately for administration and coordination activities until June 30, 1967.

## OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$2, 485, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	2, 351, 000
House allowance.....	2, 351, 000
Committee recommendation.....	2, 351, 000

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in recommending \$2,351,000 for operation and maintenance expenses in the coming fiscal year. This is the same as the budget estimate.

## OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$6, 390, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	6, 894, 000
House allowance.....	6, 894, 000
Committee recommendation.....	6, 894, 000

For fiscal year 1967 the committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,894,000, the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance. This amount will provide \$87,500 for each of the 51 State water resources research institutes, a total of \$4,463,000; \$2 million for matching grants under section 101 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964; and \$431,000 for administration of the act.



## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$4, 487, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	4, 704, 000
House allowance.....	4, 650, 000
Committee recommendation.....	4, 704, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$4,704,000, the amount of the budget estimate, for the Office of Solicitor for the coming fiscal year. This is \$54,000 more than the allowance of the House. It is the opinion of the committee that the increasing workload of this Office caused by additions to the activities of the Department of the Interior requires employment in all of the authorized positions on a full-year basis.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$4, 452, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	5, 186, 000
House allowance.....	4, 984, 100
Committee recommendation.....	5, 051, 700

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$5,051,700 for salaries and expenses in the Office of the Secretary. This will provide one position in the Office of Budget at \$14,800, and three to four positions in the Office of the Under Secretary at a total cost of \$52,800, more than the amount provided by the House of Representatives. The recommendation of the committee is \$134,300 under the budget estimate and \$67,600 more than the House allowance.

It is the opinion of the committee that the workload in the Department of the Interior requires additional assistance in the budget office and in the office of Under Secretary where a great amount of the work is concentrated.

## FOREST SERVICE

## FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

## FOREST LAND MANAGEMENT

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$162, 318, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	172, 856, 000
House allowance.....	172, 821, 000
Committee recommendation.....	174, 521, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$174,521,000 for forest land management, \$1,665,000 over the budget estimate and \$1,700,000 over the House allowance. The following table provides a comparison of the committee's recommendations with the budget estimate and with the House allowances:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
National forest protection and management.....	\$146, 589, 000	\$146, 354, 000	\$147, 854, 000
Water resource development related activities.....	6, 416, 000	6, 616, 000	6, 816, 000
Fighting forest fires.....	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
Insect and disease control.....	12, 371, 000	12, 371, 000	12, 371, 000
Acquisition of lands.....	2, 480, 000	2, 480, 000	2, 480, 000
Total.....	172, 856, 000	172, 821, 000	174, 521, 000

The committee concurs with the House increases over the budget estimate of \$150,000 for improvements on Todd Lake and the Confederate Breastworks in the George Washington National Forest, Va.; \$200,000 for water recreation facilities on the Middle Fork, Anderson River, Ind.; \$50,000 for preplanning funds for reservoir construction on the Upper Big River project, Meramec River, Mo.; and \$50,000 for engineering and recreational planning on the Lusk Creek project, Shawnee National Forest, Ill. In addition, the committee recommends that \$85,000 contained in the budget estimate for planning funds of the Missoula Equipment Development Center be provided.

The committee proposes that the following increases over the budget estimates be approved:

Construction of a dam at the Trout Pond recreation area, George Washington National Forest, W. Va.....	\$410, 000
Construction of a visitor center, Mammoth Lakes, Calif., Inyo National Forest.....	421, 000
Recreation development, Monroe Reservoir, Wayne Hoosier National Forest, Ind.....	200, 000
Recreation management, Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Minnesota.....	100, 000
Additional recreational facilities, Lake Michigan Recreation Area, Michigan.....	180, 00
Construction of a bathhouse, Lake Glendale, Shawnee National Forest, Ill.....	105, 000
Preparation of plans and specifications, headquarters building, Black Hills National Forest, Custer, S. Dak.....	85, 000
Elevator installation, Blanchard Springs Caverns, Ozark National Forest, Arkansas.....	114, 000

#### FOREST RESEARCH

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$36, 764, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	34, 435, 000
House allowance.....	34, 955, 000
Committee recommendation.....	38, 578, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$38,578,000 distributed as set forth in the following table. This is \$4,143,000 greater than the budget estimate and \$3,623,000 greater than the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Forest and range management.....	\$13, 909, 000	\$13, 859, 000	\$14, 724, 000
Forest protection.....	8, 859, 000	8, 859, 000	9, 039, 000
Forest products and engineering.....	7, 176, 000	6, 926, 000	7, 036, 000
Forest resource economics.....	4, 491, 000	4, 309, 000	4, 419, 000
Forest research construction.....		1, 002, 000	3, 360, 000
Total.....	34, 435, 000	34, 955, 000	38, 578, 000

The recommendation of the committee provides for the allowances of the House of Representatives over the budget estimate as follows: construction of a forest hydrology laboratory at Oxford, Miss. (\$450,000); and planning of research facilities at seven locations (\$552,000).

The committee recommendation provides for the following amounts to be appropriated over the House allowance:

Beaver Creek project, Arizona watershed program-----	\$140, 000
( \$50,000 for data collection and analysis; \$60,000 for extending analyses and evaluations of watershed treatment to other areas; and \$30,000 for additional studies of prescribed fire.)	
Additional staffing at the Forest Service laboratory, Morgantown, W. Va.-----	250, 000
( \$140,000 for wildlife habitat research and \$110,000 for forest engineering research.)	
Additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Alexandria, La.-----	50, 000
Research on elk management, Laramie, Wyo-----	100, 000
Additional recreation research, Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Minn-----	100, 000
Additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Rapid City, S. Dak-----	60, 000
Additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Bottineau, N. Dak-----	40, 000
Alpine snow and avalanche control research, Fort Collins, Colo-----	175, 000
Additional staffing at the Southern Hardwood Laboratory, Stoneville, Miss-----	250, 000
Forest management research, Bend, Oreg-----	100, 000
Preparation of design and specifications, Forest Service Laboratories:	
Lincoln, Nebr-----	28, 000
Burlington, Vt-----	40, 000
Durham, N.H-----	75, 000
Moscow, Idaho-----	40, 000
Duluth, Minn-----	35, 000
Construction of an addition to the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Athens, Ga-----	1, 000, 000
Construction, Silviculture and Animal Problems Laboratory, Olympia, Wash-----	450, 000
Construction, Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Carbondale, Ill-----	690, 000

The committee is impressed by the need for a wood chemistry building at the U.S. Forest Products Laboratory, Madison, Wis. This facility is essential to progress in the control of air and water pollution from pulp and paper manufacture. The committee urges the Forest Service to consider carefully the inclusion of funds for construction of this building in the fiscal year 1968 budget.

A proposal for a wilderness recreation research program at Missoula, Mont., was brought to the committee's attention. While the committee has a continuing interest in the development of wilderness area recreation, it asks that the Forest Service clarify what such a research program would embrace, its objectives, and proposed levels of funding.

#### STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY COOPERATION

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$17, 513, 000
Budget estimate, 1967-----	17, 897, 000
House allowance-----	17, 897, 000
Committee recommendation-----	17, 897, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$17,897,000 for State and private forestry cooperation. This is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance, and is set forth by activities in the following table:

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Forest fire control-----	\$12, 811, 000	\$12, 811, 000	\$12, 811, 000
Forest tree planting-----	300, 000	300, 000	300, 000
Forest management and processing-----	3, 538, 000	3, 538, 000	3, 538, 000
General forestry assistance-----	1, 248, 000	1, 248, 000	1, 248, 000
Total-----	17, 897, 000	17, 897, 000	17, 897, 000



## FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

## (Liquidation of contract authorization)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$101, 172, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	102, 530, 000
House allowance.....	101, 230, 000
Committee recommendation.....	101, 230, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$101,230,000, the amount of the House allowance and \$1,300,000 less than the budget estimate for forest roads and trails. This will provide funds to meet contract obligations accruing under the Federal-Aid Highway Act.

## TIMBER DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION LOANS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Appropriation, 1966.....	None
Budget estimate, 1967.....	\$500, 000
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	None

The committee does not recommend restoration of the language and the funds proposed for timber development organization loans and technical assistance. As of April 15, 1966, only a little more than \$59,000 had been expended of the \$1 million which was appropriated for this purpose in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965. It was testified at the hearings that the only expenditure which had been made at that time (March 4, 1966) was for a study to determine exactly what constitutes a timber development organization which it was indicated was needed in order that adequate judgments could be made as to the suitability and effectiveness of an application for a feasibility study of an area having potential prospects for successful operation of timber development organizations. After this study is completed and there develops a reasonable certainty that available funds will be exhausted, the committee will give consideration to a request for supplemental appropriations.

## ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

## SPECIAL ACTS

## (Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$80, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	80, 000
House allowance.....	80, 000
Committee recommendation.....	80, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$80,000 for purchase with national forests receipts of lands in various national forests in Utah, Nevada, and California. Purchase of these lands will be made in order to minimize erosion and flood damage. The amount recommended by the committee is the same as the House allowance and the budget estimate.

## ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

## UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

Appropriation, 1966.....	None
Budget estimate, 1967.....	\$300, 000
House allowance.....	300, 000
Committee recommendation.....	300, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$300,000, as authorized by Public Law 89-226, approved October 1, 1965, for the purchase of approximately 10,000 acres of nonfederally owned land on the South Fork of the Provo River within the Uinta National Forest in Utah. The purpose of this purchase is to control floods and reduce soil erosion through restoration of proper vegetative cover. The committee's recommendation is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$700, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	700, 000
House allowance.....	700, 000
Committee recommendation.....	700, 000

The committee recommends \$700,000, the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance, for cooperative range improvements. This money is to be derived from grazing fees received by the Treasury from each national forest under the provisions of the Granger-Thye Act.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1, 000, 000
House allowance.....	1, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 000, 000

The committee recommends \$1 million for assistance to States for tree planting under authorization of title IV of the Agricultural Act of 1956. This is the same amount as the budget estimate and the House allowance. These funds are matched by States participating in the program, and, in addition to timber production, provide benefits to soil conservation, watershed protection, wildlife habitat, and recreation.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$71, 500
Budget estimate, 1967.....	61, 400
House allowance.....	61, 400
Committee recommendation.....	61, 400

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$61,400, the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance, for salaries and expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$123, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	115, 000
House allowance.....	115, 000
Committee recommendation.....	115, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$115,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts. This is the same as the House allowance and the budget estimate.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

## INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$66, 193, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	73, 448, 000
House allowance.....	73, 250, 000
Committee recommendation.....	73, 671, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$73,671,000 for Indian health activities. This is \$421,000 over the House allowance and \$223,000 over the budget estimate.

The committee's recommendation will provide for the budgeted increases for contract medical care, field health services, and administration, and most of the proposed increase for hospital health services. The committee concurs with the action of the House of Representatives in providing \$250,000 over the budgeted amount for initiating a program to eradicate trachoma among the Indians. The committee believes, however, and this view is substantiated by information furnished by the Public Health Service, that \$250,000 per annum for a period of years is the optimum amount which can be utilized. The committee proposes, therefore, that the additional \$250,000 of available funds which the House of Representatives directed be used along with the increased appropriation, be restored to the hospital health services budget and be distributed among consultant services to broaden medical coverage and improve quality of care, maintenance and rehabilitation for overcoming the existing backlog in that work, and equipment.

The committee also proposes that \$100,000 be added to the budget for the purpose of establishing an areawide preventive mental health program in Alaska, and that \$321,000 more than the budget request be provided for operation of a health clinic in Rapid City, S. Dak., to care for indigent Indians in that city.

## CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$14, 096, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	14, 422, 000
House allowance.....	13, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	13, 928, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$13,928,000 for construction of hospitals and clinics, personnel quarters, alterations, and sanitation facilities. This is \$928,000 more than the House allowance and \$494,000 less than the budget estimate.

The increase recommended by the committee over the House allowance will provide \$87,000 for renovation of a building in Rapid City, S. Dak., for use as an outpatient clinic to provide adequate health care to indigent Indians in that city; \$93,000 for planning a Public Health Service Indian hospital at Claremore, Okla.; and \$748,000 to provide the full amount for sanitation facilities proposed in the budget estimate.

The committee has concurred with the House allowance for the Indian Health Service construction program except as to sanitation facilities. However, the committee does not agree that the reduction approved by the House of Representatives can be met on the basis of anticipated slippage in the construction program during fiscal year



1967. For this reason, the committee directs that the reduction made by the House of Representatives be distributed, except as to sanitation facilities, as indicated in the letter from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated April 8, 1966, which is reproduced at pages 2199 to 2205 of the hearings of this committee on the fiscal year 1967 budget estimate for the Division of Indian Health.

After extensive study and careful review of possible alternatives, funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1966 for construction of a medical center, including a research unit, at Phoenix, Arizona. The committee directs that there be no further delays in completing the planning of and contracting for construction of a new facility on the available site on which the old inadequate Public Health Service hospital is now located.

## OFFICE OF EDUCATION

### ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1, 000, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1, 000, 000
House allowance.....	1, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 000, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance and the budget estimate of \$1 million to strengthen the teaching of arts and humanities in elementary and secondary schools. Of the amount recommended, \$500,000 is to be available for purchase of equipment and minor remodeling necessary for arts and humanities education; and \$500,000 for advanced study to improve the qualifications of teachers and supervisors of arts and humanities.

## INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$347, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	438, 000
House allowance.....	382, 000
Committee recommendation.....	382, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$382,000 for salaries and expenses of the Indian Claims Commission, which is the same as the House allowance but is \$56,000 less than the budget estimate. The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in designating the \$35,000 increase over last year's appropriation for expense of court reporting service.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$800, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1, 144, 000
House allowance.....	1, 005, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 005, 000

For salaries and expenses, National Capital Planning Commission, during fiscal year 1967 the committee proposes an appropriation of \$1,005,000. This is \$139,000 less than the budget estimate and the same as the House allowance.

### LAND ACQUISITION, NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK, PARKWAY, AND PLAYGROUND SYSTEM

Appropriation, 1966.....	None
Budget estimate, 1967.....	\$6, 100, 000
House allowance.....	None
Committee recommendation.....	None

The committee concurs with the action of the House of Representatives in allowing no funds for purchase of lands in Fairfax County, Va., and in Prince Georges County, Md., for which \$3,200,000 and \$2,900,000, respectively, was proposed. After House action on this bill, this committee was advised by the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission that the Commission is now studying with Fairfax County authorities the most appropriate program for land and scenic easement acquisition. It was indicated that this study will not be completed in sufficient time for action to be taken during consideration of this bill.

The \$2,900,000 proposed for acquisition of the parkway lands in Prince Georges County would have to be matched by Maryland State funds in order that the land purchases could be made. The Legislature of the State of Maryland in passing an act to authorize the Prince Georges County commissioners to issue bonds for the purpose of securing funds to match the Federal appropriations for land purchases specified that none of the bond proceeds could be expended for land purchases along the shoreline between Broad Creek and Fort Washington. Also, since passage of this bill by the House of Representatives, both the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission and the Secretary of the Interior have advised the committee that the so-called inland route between Broad Creek and Fort Washington in Prince Georges County is unacceptable to those agencies.

It is the committee's view that inasmuch as the money is not yet available in Maryland for matching the Federal sums, and since there exists a question as to when Maryland funds will be forthcoming, no useful purpose will be served by providing land acquisition funds which most likely would not be used during fiscal year 1967.

### NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$425, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1, 575, 000
House allowance.....	1, 400, 000
Committee recommendation.....	1, 400, 000

The committee concurs with the House allowance of \$1,400,000 for salaries and expenses for this Agency. The Agency did not ask that the \$125,000 reduction from the budget estimate be restored.

### CONSTRUCTION, RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$3, 679, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	17, 055, 000
House allowance.....	9, 055, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 055, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,055,000 for construction of the rail rapid transit system in the District of Columbia with short extensions into Arlington County, Va., and Montgomery

County, Md. The reduction of \$8 million from the budget estimate is the Federal share of the cost of acquiring tunnel liner for which a fairly long procurement leadtime is required. The committee agrees with the House of Representatives that should progress be such that funds for acquisition of the tunnel liner are required during the coming fiscal year, the National Capital Transportation Agency should return to Congress with a supplemental budget estimate.

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$5, 700, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	13, 930, 000
House allowance.....	7, 000, 000
Committee recommendation.....	9, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$9 million for use in fiscal year 1967 in carrying out the provisions of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. This is \$4,930,000 under the budget estimate and \$2 million over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives.

Of the amount recommended by the committee, \$4 million is for the National Endowment on the Arts under section 5(c) of the act; \$2 million is for the National Endowment on the Arts under section 5(h) of the act to be used for grants to States; \$2 million is for the National Endowment for the Humanities under section 7(c) of the act; and \$1 million is for administrative expenses, an amount \$180,000 less than the budget estimate. Any amount above the sums proposed for each of the endowments for grants-in-aid shall be obtained from funds available under section 11(b) of the act.

It is the desire of the committee that the amount provided for the National Endowment for the Arts for grants-in-aid be distributed as indicated in the letter from the chairman of the endowment to the chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations which considered this bill (p. 2211, Senate hearings, fiscal year 1967).

The \$2 million recommended for the National Endowment on the Humanities is to be distributed as follows:

For fellowships:

100 1-year fellowships for young scholar-teachers.....	\$750, 000
200 summer fellowships for scholar-teachers.....	300, 000
For 50 grants to individual (mature) scholars.....	750, 000
For studies of educational radio and television.....	100, 000
For "talking books" to be made available for other than blind persons.....	100, 000

The committee recommends addition of language to the bill which will prevent use of any funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities for making a grant or other payment to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.

## PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$750, 000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	907, 000
House allowance.....	907, 000
Committee recommendation.....	907, 000



The committee proposes an appropriation of \$907,000 for the Public Land Law Review Commission. This is the same as the budget estimate and the House allowance.

### SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$18,468,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	23,437,000
House allowance.....	22,523,000
Committee recommendation.....	22,844,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$22,844,000 for the Smithsonian Institution. This is \$593,000 less than the budget estimate and \$321,000 more than the House allowance. The committee has recommended that \$271,000 deleted from the budget request by the House be restored for automatic data processing. Also, the committee proposes appropriation of \$50,000 to be used by the Office of Exhibits for preparation of an Alaskan Centenary exhibit.

#### MUSEUM PROGRAMS AND ASSOCIATED RESEARCH IN THE NATURAL SCIENCES AND CULTURAL HISTORY

##### (Special foreign currency program)

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$1,300,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	5,700,000
House allowance.....	2,316,000
Committee recommendation.....	2,316,000

For the special foreign currency program of the Smithsonian Institution the committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,316,000, the amount of the House allowance and \$3,384,000 less than the budget estimate. This appropriation will be used to purchase excess foreign currencies held by the United States with which contracts will be made with American universities and museums, and other institutions to conduct archeological excavations or research in foreign countries; and to permit the Smithsonian Institution to expand its commitments in systematic and environmental biology in certain foreign countries.

### NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

#### CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS

Appropriation, 1956.....	\$1,539,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	1,589,000
House allowance.....	1,589,000
Committee recommendation.....	1,589,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,589,000, the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance, for construction of a multiclimate animal exhibition building at the National Zoological Park, and for planning a public service and administration building.

#### RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

Appropriation, 1956.....	\$2,248,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	2,300,000
House allowance.....	2,300,000
Committee recommendation.....	2,300,000

The committee proposes that \$2,300,000 be appropriated to the Smithsonian Institution for the purpose of restoring and renovating the old Court of Claims building, for planning the rehabilitation and improvement of the Arts and Industries Building, for various feasibility studies, and for making repairs to the Belmont Study Center. The committee's recommendation is in agreement with the budget estimate and the House allowance.

### NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$2,465,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	2,765,000
House allowance.....	2,694,000
Committee recommendation.....	2,718,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$2,718,000 for salaries and expenses of the National Gallery of Art. This is \$47,000 less than the budget estimate and \$24,000 more than the House allowance. The increase over the House allowance is for establishment of an Office of Information with three employees which the committee believes is necessary in order more adequately to make known to the public the availability and existence of facilities and exhibits at the National Gallery of Art.

### CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$25,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	35,000
House allowance.....	25,000
Committee recommendation.....	35,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$35,000, the amount of the budget estimate and \$10,000 more than the House allowance, for salaries and expenses in fiscal year 1967 of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission. The committee is of the opinion that the amount of work which remains to be done before this Commission goes out of existence in May of 1967 requires the additional personnel which the \$10,000 will provide, if the required work of the Commission is to be accomplished.

### LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966.....	\$25,000
Budget estimate, 1967.....	25,000
House allowance.....	25,000
Committee recommendation.....	25,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$25,000, the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance for salaries and expenses of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission in fiscal year 1967.

FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR ALASKA

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$174, 000
Budget estimate, 1967-----	190, 000
House allowance-----	190, 000
Committee recommendation-----	190, 000

For fiscal year 1967 the committee recommends that the Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska be provided \$190,000 for salaries and expenses. Of this amount, \$141,000 is for the Field Committee and \$49,000 is for the Review Committee.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1966-----	\$20, 000
Budget estimate, 1967-----	80, 000
House allowance-----	80, 000
Committee recommendation-----	80, 000

The committee recommends appropriation of the balance of the authorization, \$80,000, for the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission. This authorization was provided to enable the Commission to consider changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or to select a new design for this memorial.



## TRUST FUND RECEIPTS

(Not a charge against general budget revenues)

	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Department of the Interior: <sup>1</sup>			
Deposits by individuals for surveying public lands.....	\$30,000	\$30,000	-----
Administration and protection of grazing districts.....	550,000	550,000	-----
Trust funds, Alaska townsites, Bureau of Land Management.....	5,000	5,000	-----
Indian moneys, proceeds of labor, agencies, school, etc.....	3,000,000	3,000,000	-----
Miscellaneous trust funds of Indian tribes.....	103,801,000	103,371,000	-\$430,000
Donations, National Park Service.....	750,000	750,000	-----
Gifts or bequests of personal property, National Parks.....	38,000	38,000	-----
Advances from District of Columbia, National Park Service.....	15,000,000	15,000,000	-----
Birthplace of Abraham Lincoln, preservation of, national parks.....	2,540	2,540	-----
Advances, authorized services, Geological Survey.....	2,100,000	2,100,000	-----
Contributed funds, Bureau of Mines.....	1,600,000	1,600,000	-----
Contributed funds, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	925,000	925,000	+3,000
Inspection and grading of fishing products, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	675,000	700,000	+25,000
Contributed funds, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	72,000	74,000	+2,000
Cooperation with foreign agencies, Office of Saline Water.....	20,500	-----	-20,500
Total, Department of the Interior.....	128,566,040	128,145,540	-420,500
Department of Agriculture—Forest Service cooperative work.....	28,955,000	29,955,000	+1,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Exclusive of Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

## TRUST FUND RECEIPTS—Continued

(Not a charge against general budget revenues)

	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Other agencies:			
National Capital Planning Commission: Contributed funds.....	\$102,000	\$6,100,000	+\$5,998,000
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: Donations.....	1,000,000	2,000,000	+1,000,000
Smithsonian Institution: Canal Zone biological area fund.....	15,000	15,000	-----
Contributions, Indian sanitation facilities.....	157,000	145,000	--12,000
Total, other agencies.....	30,229,000	38,215,000	+7,986,000
Grand total.....	158,795,040	166,360,540	+7,565,500

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1966 budget document for 1967. Subject to further revision.

## PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS

	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Department of the Interior: <sup>1</sup>			
Payments to State and local governments:			
Leasing of grazing lands.....	\$1,000	\$1,000	-----
Payments to States (proceeds of sales).....	220,392	266,000	+\$45,608
Payments of royalties to Oklahoma.....	2,813	10,000	+7,187
Payments to States (grazing fees).....	2,000	2,000	-----
Payments to States from grazing receipts, public lands.....	618,000	618,000	-----
Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands, payments to Coos Bay and Douglas Counties, Oreg., in lieu of taxes.....	900,000	1,012,000	+112,000
Oregon and California grant lands, payment to counties.....	20,037,859	21,250,000	+1,212,141
Mineral leasing, payment to States.....	50,590,000	53,545,000	+2,955,000
Payment to counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Land Management.....	131,000	139,000	+8,000
Claim and treaty obligations, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	160,500	160,500	-----
Acquisition of lands and loans to Indians in Oklahoma, act of June 26, 1936.....	10,000	10,000	-----
Education expenses, children of employees, Yellowstone National Park.....	94,200	96,000	+1,800
Payments to State of Wyoming, in lieu of taxes on lands in Grand Teton National Park, National Park Service.....	24,000	24,500	+500
Internal Revenue collections for Virgin Islands, Office of Territories.....	10,405,984	8,000,000	-2,405,984
Payment to Alaska from Pribilof Islands receipts.....		200,000	+200,000
Payment to counties under Migratory Bird Conservation Act.....	1,459,000	1,500,000	+41,000
Payment to counties, national grasslands, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	2,000	2,000	-----
Subtotal.....	84,658,748	86,836,000	+2,177,252

See footnotes at end of table, p. 41.



## PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

	Appropriation estimate, 1966	Appropriation estimate, 1967	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Department of the Interior—Continued			
Receipts applied to operations:			
Expenses, sale of timber, etc., on reclamation land.....	\$2,000	\$2,000	-----
Expenses, Public Land Administration Act.....	1,200,000	1,200,000	-----
Operation and maintenance revenue, Indian irrigation systems.....	3,890,000	3,890,000	-----
Power revenues, Indian irrigation projects.....	2,730,000	2,730,000	-----
Indian arts and crafts fund.....	200	200	-----
Operation, management, and maintenance and demolition of federally acquired properties, Independence National Park, National Park Service.....	3,900	4,000	+\$100
Payments from proceeds of sale of water, Geological Survey.....	1,000	1,000	-----
Migratory Bird Conservation Fund.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	-----
Management of national wildlife refuges and enforcement activities.....	199,134	1,051,000	+851,866
Expenses incident to sale of refuge products.....	228,000	229,000	+1,000
Subtotal.....	13,254,234	14,107,200	+852,966
Mixed receipts:			
Federal aid in wildlife restoration:			
Payments to States.....	19,236,000	16,170,000	−3,066,000
Applied to operations.....	964,720	1,000,000	+35,280
Federal aid in fish restoration and management:			
Payments to States.....	6,810,000	6,000,000	−810,000
Applied to operations.....	563,380	500,000	−63,380
Subtotal.....	27,574,100	23,670,000	−3,904,100
Total, Department of the Interior.....	125,487,082	124,613,200	−873,882

## Department of Agriculture—Forest Service:

## Payments to States and local governments:

Payments to States, national forests fund (25 percent fund).....

+1,296,000

Payments to Minnesota (Cook, Lake, and St. Louis Counties).....

35,504,000

36,800,000

Payments to counties, national grasslands.....

141,000

141,000

Payments to school funds, Arizona and New Mexico.....

462,000

462,000

Subtotal.....

112,000

115,000

+3,000

## Receipts applied to operations:

Expenses, brush disposal.....

36,219,000

37,518,000

+1,299,000

Roads and trails for States (10 percent fund).....

8,500,000

8,600,000

+100,000

Forest fire prevention (Smokey Bear).....

14,204,000

14,700,000

+496,000

Restoration of forest lands and improvements.....

32,000

32,000

-----

Subtotal.....

100,000

100,000

-----

Total, Department of Agriculture—Forest Service.....

22,836,000

23,432,000

+596,000

Total, permanent appropriations.....

59,055,000

60,950,000

+1,895,000

-----

184,542,082

185,563,200

+1,021,118

1 Exclusive of Bonneville Power Administration, Bureau of Reclamation, Southeastern Power Administration, and Southwestern Power Administration.

NOTE.—Amounts as estimated and shown in the January 1966 budget document for 1967. Subject to further revision.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967**

Item	Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the House bill for 1967	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimate, 1967	House bill
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT							
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT							
Management of lands and resources.....	\$49,080,000	\$48,755,000	\$48,755,000	\$48,970,000	—\$110,000	+\$215,000	+\$215,000
Construction and maintenance.....	3,150,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	3,062,000	—88,000	+162,000	+162,000
Public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization).....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000			
<i>Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite appropriation of receipts)</i> .....	1 (16,945,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	(—7,195,000)		
<i>Range improvements (indefinite appropriation of receipts)</i> .....	(1,346,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	(+102,000)		
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	54,230,000	53,655,000	53,655,000	54,032,000	—198,000	+377,000	+377,000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS							
Education and welfare services.....	105,846,000	115,296,000	114,475,000	115,061,300	+9,215,300	—234,700	+586,300
Resources management.....	42,796,000	44,611,000	44,086,000	44,086,000	+1,290,000	—525,000	
Construction.....	235,151,000	57,164,000	55,325,000	56,848,000	+21,697,000	—316,000	+1,523,000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization).....	17,445,000	16,754,000	16,754,000	16,889,000	—556,000	+135,000	+135,000
General administrative expenses.....	4,520,000	4,677,000	4,623,000	4,623,000	+103,000	—54,000	
Menominee educational grants.....	44,000				—44,000		
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds.....	205,802,000	238,502,000	235,263,000	237,507,300	+31,705,300	—994,700	+2,244,300
<i>Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation)</i> .....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			



BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION									
Salaries and expenses-----	3,398,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,960,000	+562,000	+50,000	+50,000	
<i>Land and water conservation (indefinite appropriation of receipts)</i> -----	(125,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(-15,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation-----	3,398,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,960,000	+562,000	+50,000	+50,000	
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES									
Administration of territories-----	14,579,000	10,513,000	10,513,000	10,513,000	10,513,000	-4,066,000			
Trust territory of the Pacific Islands-----	17,344,000	17,494,000	17,494,000	17,494,000	17,494,000	+150,000			
<i>Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation</i> -----	(100,000)								
Total, Office of Territories-----	31,923,000	28,007,000	28,007,000	28,007,000	28,007,000	-3,916,000			
THE ALASKA RAILROAD									
Payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund-----	4,100,000					-4,100,000			
Total, Public Land Management-----	299,453,000	324,074,000	320,835,000	320,835,000	323,506,300	+24,053,300	-567,700	+2,671,300	
MINERAL RESOURCES									
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY									
Surveys, investigations, and rescue-----	\$71,680,870	\$80,520,000		72,782,000	80,932,000	+9,251,130	+412,000	+8,150,000	
BUREAU OF MINES									
Conservation and development of mineral resources-----	31,891,000	435,166,000	31,540,000	31,540,000	34,940,000	+3,049,000	-226,000	+3,400,000	
Health and safety-----	9,507,000	9,390,000	9,390,000	9,390,000	9,390,000	-117,000			
Solid waste disposal-----	\$1,400,000	4,335,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,300,000	+2,900,000	-35,000	+300,000	
Appalachian region mining area restoration-----		10,566,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	7,000,000	+7,000,000	-3,566,000	-1,000,000	
General administrative expenses-----	1,529,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	+27,000			
<i>Hellum Fund:</i>									
<i>Borrowing authorization</i> -----	(16,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(+10,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Mines-----	44,327,000	61,013,000	54,486,000	54,486,000	57,186,000	+12,859,000	-3,827,000	+2,700,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 50.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the House bill for 1967	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimate, 1967	House bill
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued							
MINERAL RESOURCES—continued							
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$7,220,000	\$8,237,000	\$8,220,000	\$8,220,000	+\$1,000,000	—\$17,000	-----
Salaries and expenses.....	704,000	722,000	722,000	722,000	+18,000	-----	-----
Total, Mineral Resources.....	123,931,870	150,492,000	136,210,000	147,060,000	+23,128,130	—3,432,000	+\$10,850,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS							
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE							
Salaries and expenses.....	444,000	( <sup>6</sup> )	-----	-----	—444,000	-----	-----
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES							
Management and investigations of resources.....	21,838,000	20,092,000	20,312,000	21,076,000	—762,000	+984,000	+764,000
Management and investigations of resources (appropriation of receipts).....	-----	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	-----	-----
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Construction.....	300,000	200,000	500,000	500,000	+200,000	+300,000	-----
Construction of fishing vessels.....	1,980,000	495,000	1,245,000	1,245,000	—735,000	+750,000	-----
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development.....	75,000,000	3,300,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	—2,000,000	—300,000	-----
Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation.....	4,800,000	3,210,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	—90,000	+1,500,000	-----
General administrative expenses.....	674,000	739,000	739,000	2,675,000	+2,675,000	+2,675,000	+2,675,000
				739,000	+65,000	-----	-----

<i>Administration of Pribilof Islands (indefinite appropriation of receipts)</i>	(2, 454, 000)	(2, 468, 000)	(2, 468, 000)	(2, 468, 000)	(+14, 000)	-----
<i>Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund</i>	(309, 000)	(309, 000)	(309, 000)	(309, 000)	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries	34, 592, 000	28, 036, 000	30, 506, 000	33, 945, 000	-647, 000	+3, 439, 000
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE						
Management and investigations of resources	36, 134, 300	37, 304, 000	37, 164, 000	39, 151, 400	+3, 027, 100	+1, 857, 400
Construction	* 18, 299, 200	3, 169, 000	5, 130, 000	8, 341, 600	-9, 957, 600	+3, 211, 600
Migratory bird conservation account	7, 500, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	-1, 500, 000	-----
Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects	-----	1, 350, 000	1, 000, 000	500, 000	+500, 000	-500, 000
Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation	-----	-----	-----	2, 675, 000	+2, 675, 000	+2, 675, 000
General administrative expenses	1, 458, 000	1, 564, 000	1, 549, 000	1, 564, 000	+106, 000	+15, 000
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	63, 391, 500	49, 387, 000	50, 843, 000	58, 242, 000	-5, 149, 500	+7, 399, 000
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE						
Management and protection	32, 366, 000	36, 177, 000	35, 694, 000	36, 171, 600	+3, 805, 600	+477, 600
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities	24, 660, 000	27, 022, 000	26, 680, 000	26, 680, 000	+2, 020, 000	-----
Construction	26, 177, 000	23, 500, 000	22, 894, 000	23, 494, 000	-2, 683, 000	+600, 000
Parkway and road construction (liquidation of contract authorization)	33, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	-3, 000, 000	-----
General administrative expenses	2, 465, 000	2, 562, 100	2, 562, 000	2, 562, 000	+97, 000	-----
Total, National Park Service	118, 668, 000	119, 251, 100	117, 830, 000	118, 907, 600	+239, 600	+1, 077, 600
Total, Fish, Wildlife, and Parks	217, 095, 500	196, 684, 100	199, 179, 000	211, 094, 600	-6, 000, 900	+11, 915, 600
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER						
Salaries and expenses	20, 000, 000	28, 595, 000	27, 500, 000	27, 500, 000	+7, 500, 000	-----
Operation and maintenance	* 2, 485, 000	2, 351, 000	2, 351, 000	2, 351, 000	-134, 000	-----
Total, Office of Saline Water	22, 485, 000	30, 946, 000	29, 851, 000	29, 851, 000	+7, 366, 000	-1, 095, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 50.



COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued

Item	Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the House bill for 1967	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimate, 1967	House bill
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR--Continued							
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH							
Salaries and expenses.....	10 \$6,390,000	\$6,894,000	\$6,894,000	\$6,894,000	+\$504,000		
Salaries and expenses.....	4,487,000	4,704,000	4,650,000	4,704,000	+217,000		\$+54,000
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR							
Salaries and expenses.....	4,452,200	5,186,000	4,984,100	5,051,700	+599,500	-\$134,300	+67,600
Total, direct appropriations.....	678,294,570	718,980,100	702,603,100	728,161,600	+49,897,030	+9,181,500	+25,558,500
Total, appropriation of receipts.....	145,745,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	-21,079,000		
Total, borrowing authorization.....	16,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	+10,000,000		
Total, title I, Department of the Interior.....	840,039,570	869,646,100	853,269,100	878,827,600	+38,788,030	+9,181,500	+25,558,500
TITLE II--RELATED AGENCIES							
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE							
FOREST SERVICE							
Forest protection and utilization:							
Forest land management.....	162,318,000	172,856,000	172,821,000	174,521,000	+12,203,000	+1,665,000	+1,700,000
Forest research.....	36,764,000	34,435,000	34,955,000	38,578,000	+1,814,000	+4,143,000	+3,623,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	17,513,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	+384,000		
Total, forest protection and utilization.....	216,595,000	225,188,000	225,673,000	230,996,000	+14,401,000	+5,808,000	+5,323,000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization).....	11 101,172,000	102,530,000	101,230,000	101,230,000	+58,000	-1,300,000	

[illegible]

See footnotes at end of table, p. 50.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued**

Item	Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the House bill for 1967	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimate, 1967	House bill
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued							
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$ 425,000	\$1,575,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	+\$975,000	—\$175,000	-----
Construction, rail rapid transit system.....	\$ 3,679,000	17,055,000	9,055,000	9,055,000	+5,376,000	—8,000,000	-----
Total, National Capital Transportation Agency.....	4,104,000	18,630,000	10,455,000	10,455,000	+6,351,000	—8,175,000	-----
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$ 5,700,000	13,930,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	+3,300,000	—4,930,000	+2,000,000
Endowment for the arts.....	2,000,000	-----	-----	-----	—2,000,000	-----	-----
Endowment for the humanities.....	3,000,000	-----	-----	-----	—3,000,000	-----	-----
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.....	10,700,000	13,930,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	—1,700,000	—4,930,000	+\$2,000,000
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS							
Salaries and expenses.....	50,000	-----	-----	-----	—50,000	-----	-----
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$ 750,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	+157,000	-----	-----
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION							
Salaries and expenses.....	18,468,000	23,437,000	22,523,000	22,844,000	+4,376,000	—593,000	+321,000
Archeological research and excavation (special foreign currency program).....	1,300,000	5,700,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	+1,016,000	—3,384,000	-----
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	1,539,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	+50,000	-----	-----
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	2,248,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	+52,000	-----	-----



Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	2,465,000	2,765,000	2,694,000	2,718,000	+253,000	-47,000	+24,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	26,020,000	35,791,000	31,422,000	31,767,000	+5,747,000	-4,024,000	+345,000
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses.....	100,000				-100,000		
CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	+10,000		+10,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION							
Construction, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial.....	1,400,000				-1,400,000		
Total, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial.....	1,425,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	-1,390,000		+10,000
LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000			
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA							
Grants.....	4,500,000				-4,500,000		
FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR ALASKA							
Salaries and expenses.....	174,000	190,000	190,000	190,000	+16,000		
COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$ 200,000				-200,000		

See footnotes at end of table, p. 50.

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1966, AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1967—Continued**

Item	Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Recommended in the House bill for 1967	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriation, 1966	Budget estimate, 1967	House bill
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Continued							
HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSION							
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	\$20,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	\$80,000	+\$60,000		
Total, direct appropriations.....	449,465,500	495,834,400	467,120,400	476,147,400	+\$26,681,900	-\$19,687,000	+\$9,027,000
Total, appropriation of receipts.....	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000			
Total, title II, related agencies.....	450,245,500	496,614,400	467,900,400	476,927,400	+\$26,681,900	-\$19,687,000	+\$9,027,000
Grand total.....	1,290,285,070	1,366,260,500	1,321,169,500	1,355,755,000	+\$65,469,930	-\$10,505,500	+\$34,585,500
Consisting of—							
Direct appropriations.....	1,127,760,070	1,214,814,500	1,169,723,500	1,204,309,000	+\$76,548,930	-\$10,505,500	+\$34,585,500
Appropriation of receipts.....	146,525,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	-\$21,079,000		
Borrowing authorization.....	16,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	+\$10,000,000		

<sup>1</sup> Includes \$6,320,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

<sup>2</sup> Includes \$638,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

<sup>3</sup> Includes \$6,600,000 in S. Doc. 86.

<sup>4</sup> Includes \$3,700,000 in S. Doc. 86.

<sup>5</sup> Included in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

<sup>6</sup> Office terminated—functions transferred to Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Office of the Secretary.

<sup>7</sup> In addition, \$2,105,203 provided in 1965 Supplemental Appropriation Act.

<sup>8</sup> Includes \$11,222,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

<sup>9</sup> In addition \$1,407,000 available under "Construction, operation, and maintenance" for replacement of demonstration plant, San Diego, Calif., heretofore granted previously.

<sup>10</sup> Includes \$500,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

<sup>11</sup> Includes \$22,500,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

<sup>12</sup> Includes \$146,000 in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966.

<sup>13</sup> In addition, \$490,000 provided by transfer.

<sup>14</sup> In addition, \$320,551 available by transfer.







89TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

Calendar No. 1117

# H. R. 14215

[Report No. 1154]

---

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 13, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

MAY 10, 1966

Reported by Mr. BIBLE (for Mr. HAYDEN), with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

1        *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2        *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3        That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4        in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5        ment of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year  
6        ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, namely:

## 1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## 2 PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

## 3 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## 4 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

5 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improve-  
6 ment, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classifica-  
7 tion, and performance of other functions, as authorized by  
8 law, in the management of lands and their resources under  
9 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management,  
10 ~~\$48,755,000~~ \$48,970,000.

## 11 CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

12 For acquisition, construction and maintenance of build-  
13 ings, appurtenant facilities, and other improvements, and  
14 maintenance of access roads, ~~\$2,900,000~~ \$3,062,000, to re-  
15 main available until expended.

## 16 PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

## 17 (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

18 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
19 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
20 203, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

## 21 OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

22 For expenses necessary for management, protection,  
23 and development of resources and for construction, operation,



1 and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other  
2 improvements on the revested Oregon and California Rail-  
3 road grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and  
4 California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent  
5 rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of ex-  
6 isting connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an  
7 amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all  
8 receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested  
9 Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain  
10 available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount ap-  
11 propriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on  
12 lands administered by the Forest Service shall be trans-  
13 ferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:  
14 *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein for  
15 road construction on lands other than those administered by  
16 the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of  
17 Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*,  
18 That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reim-  
19 bursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant  
20 fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the  
21 Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second  
22 paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August  
23 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

## RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft for replacement only; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appro-

1 priation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be re-  
2 imbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection  
3 (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat.  
4 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and Cali-  
5 fornia land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved  
6 May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated  
7 the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further*,  
8 That appropriations herein made may be expended on a re-  
9 imbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those  
10 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management  
11 and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral re-  
12 sources for the State of Alaska.

## 13 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

### 14 EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

15 For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare  
16 services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with  
17 States and other organizations, including payment (in ad-  
18 vance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance,  
19 and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institu-  
20 tions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy  
21 Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of  
22 rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of  
23 law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian



1 arts and crafts shops; ~~\$114,475,000~~ *\$115,061,300*: *Pro-*  
2 *vided*, That not to exceed \$85,000 of this appropriation shall  
3 be made available to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe  
4 for maintenance of law and order.

5 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

6 For expenses necessary for management, development,  
7 improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant  
8 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian  
9 Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and  
10 charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian  
11 industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts  
12 and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian  
13 arts and crafts, as authorized by law; \$44,086,000.

14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction, major repair, and improvement of ir-  
16 rigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other  
17 facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; prepa-  
18 ration of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering  
19 services by contract; ~~\$55,325,000~~ *\$56,848,000*, to remain  
20 available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum  
21 herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land  
22 within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New  
23 Mexico, South Dakota, and Utah outside of the boundaries of  
24 existing Indian reservations except lands authorized by law

1 to be acquired for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project: *Pro-*  
 2 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
 3 used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the  
 4 States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or  
 5 outside the boundaries of existing reservations except such  
 6 lands as may be required for replacement of the Wild Horse  
 7 Dam in the State of Nevada: *Provided further*, That such  
 8 amounts as may be available for the construction of the Nav-  
 9 ajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bu-  
 10 reau of Reclamation: *Provided further*, *That not to exceed*  
 11 *\$918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico,*  
 12 *School District No. 4 for construction of junior high and high*  
 13 *school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public*  
 14 *School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school.*

15 ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
 16 AUTHORIZATION)

17 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
 18 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
 19 203, ~~\$16,754,000~~ \$16,889,000 to remain available until ex-  
 20 pended.

21 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary for the general administration  
 23 of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in  
 24 field offices, \$4,623,000.

2 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended  
3 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$3,000,000  
4 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure  
5 for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay  
6 and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other  
7 assistance to Indian children attending public and private  
8 schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of  
9 admission); purchase of land and improvements on land,  
10 title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States  
11 in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and  
12 water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and  
13 other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved  
14 contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers,  
15 councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organiza-  
16 tions, including mileage for use of privately owned automo-  
17 biles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established  
18 administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian  
19 employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without  
20 regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat.  
21 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator  
22 for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the  
23 approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to  
24 the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the



1 amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced  
2 to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such pur-  
3 poses as may be designated by the governing body of the  
4 particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary:  
5 *Provided further*, That funds derived from appropriations in  
6 satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and  
7 the Court of Claims shall not be available for advances,  
8 except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney  
9 fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program plan-  
10 ning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth  
11 the purposes for which said funds will be used: *Provided*,  
12 *however*, That no part of this appropriation or other tribal  
13 funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights  
14 within the States of Nevada, Oregon, *and* Washington, ~~and~~  
15 ~~Wyoming~~, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing  
16 Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the prop-  
17 erty being exempted from local taxation, except as provided  
18 for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

19 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

20 Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except  
21 the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of  
22 motor vehicles (including thirty-five for police-type use  
23 exhibits; purchase of not to exceed ninety-three passenger

1 which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price  
2 limitation for the current fiscal year), of which seventy shall  
3 be for replacement only, which may be used for the trans-  
4 portation of Indians; advance payments for service (includ-  
5 ing services which may extend beyond the current fiscal  
6 year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June  
7 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70  
8 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision  
9 over certain Indian tribes; and expenses required by con-  
10 tinuing or permanent treaty provisions.

#### 11 BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

##### 12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recrea-  
14 tion, not otherwise provided for, ~~\$3,910,000~~ \$3,960,000.

##### 15 LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

16 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
17 the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78  
18 Stat. 897), including \$2,560,000 for administrative expenses  
19 of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal  
20 year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interests therein,  
21 in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the  
22 State or Federal agency concerned, to be derived from the  
23 Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2  
24 of said Act, and to remain available until expended, not to

1 exceed \$110,000,000 of which (1) not to exceed ~~\$76,-~~  
 2 ~~203,000~~ \$65,703,000 shall be available for payments to the  
 3 States to be matched by the individual States with an equal  
 4 amount; (2) not to exceed ~~\$17,971,500~~ \$23,471,500 shall  
 5 be available to the National Park Service; (3) not to exceed  
 6 ~~\$13,093,000~~ \$18,093,000 shall be available to the Forest  
 7 Service; and (4) not to exceed \$172,500 shall be available  
 8 to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: *Provided,*  
 9 That in the event the receipts available in the Land and  
 10 Water Conservation Fund are insufficient to provide the full  
 11 amounts specified herein, the amounts available under clauses  
 12 (1) through (4) shall be reduced proportionately.

### 13 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

#### 14 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

15 For expenses necessary for the administration of Terri-  
 16 tories and for the departmental administration of the Trust  
 17 Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the  
 18 Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices  
 19 of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as author-  
 20 ized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1661 (c) ) ; salaries of  
 21 the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secre-  
 22 tary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of the  
 23 immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591,  
 24 72 Stat. 1095) ; compensation and mileage of members of



1 the legislature in American Samoa as authorized by law (48  
2 U.S.C. sec. 1661 (c) ) ; compensation and expenses of the  
3 judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48  
4 U.S.C. 1661 (c) ) ; grants to American Samoa, in addition  
5 to current local revenues, for support of governmental func-  
6 tions; loans and grants to Guam, as authorized by law (Pub-  
7 lic Law 88-170) ; and personal services, household equip-  
8 ment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation  
9 of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American  
10 Samoa; \$10,513,000, to remain available until expended:  
11 *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein  
12 provided for are authorized to make purchases through the  
13 General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That  
14 appropriations available for the administration of Territories  
15 may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance,  
16 and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official  
17 purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found  
18 by the Secretary to be necessary.

19 TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

20 For expenses necessary for the Department of the In-  
21 terior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
22 Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
23 joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397) , and the  
24 Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330) , as amended (76 Stat.

1 171), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of  
2 the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and  
3 expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pa-  
4 cific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
5 Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of govern-  
6 mental functions; \$17,494,000, to remain available until  
7 expended: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the  
8 Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies  
9 or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust  
10 Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting  
11 Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget  
12 and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended,  
13 and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64  
14 Stat. 834): *Provided further*, That the government of the  
15 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make  
16 purchases through the General Services Administration:  
17 *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the ad-  
18 ministration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may  
19 be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and  
20 operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes  
21 and for commercial transportation purposes found by the  
22 Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of  
23 article 6 (2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
24 Congress.

## 1 ALASKA RAILROAD

## 2 ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

3 The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue  
4 available until expended for the work authorized by law,  
5 including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or  
6 coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with  
7 other branches of the Government service, for the purpose  
8 of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight,  
9 passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit  
10 and development of industries or travel in the area  
11 served; and payment of compensation and expenses as  
12 authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916  
13 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided:  
14 *Provided*, That no employee shall be paid an annual salary  
15 out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the  
16 Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS-15,  
17 except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant  
18 general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by  
19 said Act for GS-17, and five officers at not to exceed the  
20 salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS-16.



## MINERAL RESOURCES

## GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

## SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837 and 76 Stat. 427) ; classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U.S.C. 715) ; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641) ; and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; ~~\$72,782,000~~, ~~\$80,932,000~~ of which ~~\$12,350,000~~ ~~\$13,250,000~~ shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations, and \$216,000 shall remain available

1 until expended, to provide financial assistance to participants  
2 in minerals exploration projects, as authorized by law (30  
3 U.S.C. 641-646), including administration of contracts  
4 entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303 of  
5 the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended: *Provided*,  
6 That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay  
7 more than one-half the cost of any typographic mapping  
8 or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation  
9 with any State, or municipality.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

11 The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall  
12 be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-six pas-  
13 senger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimburse-  
14 ment of the General Services Administration for security  
15 guard service for protection of confidential files; con-  
16 tracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the  
17 making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it  
18 is administratively determined that such procedures are in  
19 the public interest; construction and maintenance of neces-  
20 sary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands  
21 for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S.  
22 National Committee on Geology; and payment of compen-  
23 sation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological  
24 Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the

1 United States in the negotiation and administration of inter-  
 2 state compacts.

### 3 BUREAU OF MINES

#### 4 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

#### 5 RESOURCES

6 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,  
 7 exploration, development, production, and utilization of min-  
 8 eral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Terri-  
 9 tories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and sub-  
 10 stitutes; ~~\$31,540,000~~ \$34,940,000.

#### 11 HEALTH AND SAFETY

12 For expenses necessary for promotion of health and  
 13 safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling  
 14 fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law; \$9,390,000.

#### 15 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

16 For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the  
 17 Secretary of the Interior under the Solid Waste Disposal  
 18 Act, ~~\$4,000,000~~ \$4,300,000, to remain available until  
 19 expended.

#### 20 APPALACHIAN REGION MINING AREA RESTORATION

21 For expenses necessary in carrying out a nationwide  
 22 study of strip and surface mine rehabilitation and reclama-  
 23 tion, and a program of mining area restoration, as author-



1 ized by section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Develop-  
2 ment Act of 1965, ~~\$8,000,000~~ \$7,000,000, to remain avail-  
3 able until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall  
4 not be available for the purchase, or for sharing in the cost of  
5 purchase, of lands or interests therein.

6 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary for general administration of  
8 the Bureau of Mines; \$1,556,000.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

10 Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
11 Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed  
12 seventy-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement  
13 only; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies  
14 in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Pro-*  
15 *vided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands,  
16 buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public  
17 and private sources and to prosecute projects in coopera-  
18 tion with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Pro-*  
19 *vided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized,  
20 during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through  
21 any Government agency, including corporations, any metal  
22 or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants  
23 operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such

## 3

4

## 11

## 12

13

## 19

## 20

21

22 charge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, includ-  
23 ing cooperation with the petroleum industry and State au-

1   thorities in the production, processing, and utilization of  
 2   petroleum and its products, and natural gas, \$722,000.

### 3                   BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

#### 4           MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

5       For expenses necessary for scientific and economic  
 6   studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection,  
 7   and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including  
 8   whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products;  
 9   collection, compilation, and publication of information con-  
 10   cerning such resources; promotion of education and training  
 11   of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions  
 12   related thereto, as authorized by law; ~~\$20,312,000~~ \$21,-  
 13   076,000, and in addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived from the  
 14   Pribilof Islands fund.

#### 15           MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

#### 16                   (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

17       For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
 18   Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
 19   quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of  
 20   the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as authorized by law,  
 21   \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,*  
 22   That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to



1 other appropriations to such agency, for payments in the  
2 foregoing currencies.

3 CONSTRUCTION

4 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
5 facilities required for the conservation, management, investi-  
6 gation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery  
7 resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein,  
8 \$1,245,000, to remain available until expended.

9 CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

10 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
11 the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by  
12 the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the  
13 construction of fishing vessels, \$3,000,000, to remain avail-  
14 able until expended.

15 FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

16 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

17 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the  
18 Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of  
19 1964 (78 Stat. 197), \$4,710,000, of which not to exceed  
20 \$210,000 shall be available for program administration and  
21 \$400,000 shall be available until expended pursuant to the

1 provisions of section 4 (b) of the Act: *Provided*, That the  
 2 sum of \$4,100,000 available for apportionment to the States  
 3 pursuant to section 5 (a) of the Act shall remain available  
 4 until the close of the fiscal year following the year for which  
 5 appropriated.

## 6 *ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES*

### 7 *CONSERVATION*

8 *For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the*  
 9 *Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000, to*  
 10 *remain available until expended.*

### 11 **GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES**

12 For expenses necessary for general administration of  
 13 the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses  
 14 in the regional offices, \$739,000.

### 15 **ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS**

16 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of Febru-  
 17 ary 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a-631q), there  
 18 are appropriated amounts not to exceed \$2,468,000, to be  
 19 derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

## 1     LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES

## 2                     LOAN FUND

3         During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$309,000 of  
4     the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative  
5     expenses.

## 6                     ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

7         Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
8     Commercial Fisheries shall be available for purchase of not to  
9     exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen  
10    shall be for replacement only (including one for police-type  
11    use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price  
12    limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of one re-  
13    placement aircraft; publication and distribution of bulletins  
14    as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commuta-  
15    tion of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not  
16    to exceed \$3 per man per day; options for the purchase of  
17    land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; and maintenance  
18    and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities  
19    under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries



1 to which the United States has title, and which are utilized  
 2 pursuant to law in connection with management and in-  
 3 vestigations of fishery resources.

#### 4 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

#### 5 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

6 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic  
 7 studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection,  
 8 and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except  
 9 whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of  
 10 other authorized functions related to such resources; opera-  
 11 tion of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard  
 12 National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770) ; and maintenance  
 13 of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains  
 14 Wildlife Refuge; ~~\$37,164,000~~ \$39,161,400.

#### 15 CONSTRUCTION

16 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
 17 facilities required in the conservation, management, inves-  
 18 tigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wild-  
 19 life resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests  
 20 therein, ~~\$5,130,000~~ \$8,341,600, to remain available until ex-

1    pende*d*: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance remaining  
2    on June 30, 1966, of the appropriation granted under this  
3    head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies  
4    Appropriation Act, 1966, shall remain available until  
5    expended.

6                   MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

7       For an advance to the migratory bird conservation  
8    account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16  
9    U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), \$6,000,000, to remain available until  
10   expended.

11   APPALACHIAN REGION FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION  
12                   PROJECTS

13       For expenses necessary in carrying out a fish and wildlife  
14    restoration program, as authorized by section 205 of the Ap-  
15    palachian Regional Development Act of 1965. ~~\$1,000,000~~  
16    \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,  
17    That this appropriation shall not be available for the pur-  
18    chase. or for sharing in the cost of purchase, of lands or inter-  
19    ests therein.

1     ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISH-  
2                   ERIES CONSERVATION

3         *For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of*  
4     *the Act of October 3, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000,*  
5     *to remain available until expended.*

6                   GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

7         For expenses necessary for general administration of  
8     the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such  
9     expenses in the regional offices, ~~\$1,549,000~~ \$1,564,000.

10                   ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

11         Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
12     Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shall be available for purchase  
13     of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-three passenger  
14     motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirteen are for  
15     replacement only (including sixty-three for police-type use  
16     which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price  
17     limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of not to  
18     exceed five aircraft, for replacement only; not to exceed  
19     \$50,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for  
20     information or evidence concerning violations of laws admin-  
21     istered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; publi-  
22     cation and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7  
23     U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commutation of rations for officers  
24     and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$3 per man per



1 day; insurance on official motor vehicles, aircraft and boats  
2 operated by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in  
3 foreign countries; repair of damage to public roads within  
4 and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the  
5 Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, options for the pur-  
6 chase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities  
7 incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas  
8 as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the  
9 maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings and other  
10 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Sport Fish-  
11 eries and Wildlife and to which the United States has title,  
12 and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with  
13 management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

## 14 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

### 15 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

16 For expenses necessary for the management and pro-  
17 tection of the areas and facilities administered by the Na-  
18 tional Park Service, including protection of lands in process  
19 of condemnation; plans, investigations, and studies of the  
20 recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail  
21 plans and working drawings) and archeological values in  
22 river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River  
23 Basin); and not to exceed \$88,000 for the Roosevelt

1 Campobello International Park Commission, ~~\$35,694,000~~  
2 *\$36,171,600.*

3 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL  
4 FACILITIES

5 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,  
6 and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road  
7 maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable  
8 basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities  
9 essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to  
10 law by the National Park Service, \$26,680,000.

11 CONSTRUCTION

12 For construction and improvement, without regard to  
13 the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451),  
14 of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; the repair  
15 or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other  
16 facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood,  
17 or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason  
18 of the use of funds for such purposes; and the acquisition of  
19 water rights; ~~\$22,894,000~~ *\$23,494,000*, to remain available  
20 until expended.

PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF  
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, and Great Falls Park, Virginia, except minor roads and trails; and Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia, and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$2,562,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and



1 forty-one passenger motor vehicles of which one hundred  
2 and five shall be for replacement only, including not to  
3 exceed seventy-seven for police-type use which may exceed  
4 by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the  
5 current fiscal year.

#### 6 OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

#### 7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the  
9 Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951-1958),  
10 authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for bene-  
11 ficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended,  
12 \$27,500,000, of which not to exceed \$1,445,000, shall be  
13 available for administration and coordination during the  
14 current fiscal year.

#### 15 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

16 For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants  
17 for the production of water suitable for agricultural, indus-  
18 trial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as  
19 authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended,

1 (42 U.S.C. 1958a-1958g), \$2,351,000, of which not to  
2 exceed \$206,000 shall be available for administration.

3 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions  
6 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat.  
7 329), \$6,894,000, of which not to exceed \$431,000 shall  
8 be available for administrative expenses.

9 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor,  
12 ~~\$4,650,000~~ \$4,704,000, and in addition, not to exceed  
13 \$152,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appro-  
14 priation from other accounts available to the Department  
15 of the Interior: *Provided*, That hereafter hearing officers  
16 appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed  
17 pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act (60 Stat.  
18 237), as amended.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, ~~\$4,984,100~~ \$5,051,700.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this



1 title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the  
2 payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal  
3 year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for  
4 destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in con-  
5 nection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such  
6 reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently  
7 available at the time of receipt thereof.

8 SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be  
9 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and  
10 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will con-  
11 tribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall  
12 be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity  
13 in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30,  
14 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for  
15 costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services  
16 rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
17 time such reimbursements are received.

18 SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of  
19 the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appro-  
20 priations Act, 1967, shall be available for services as  
21 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
22 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, in total  
23 amount not to exceed \$200,000; hire, maintenance and  
24 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; pur-

1 chase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private  
2 residences in the field, when authorized under regulations  
3 approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when  
4 authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in  
5 societies or associations which issue publications to members  
6 only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who  
7 are not members.

8 SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department  
9 of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for  
10 uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5  
11 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4-204).

## 12 TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

### 13 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### 14 FOREST SERVICE

##### 15 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

16 For expenses necessary for forest protection and utiliza-  
17 tion, as follows:

18 Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the  
19 Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the  
20 administration, improvement, development, and management  
21 of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and  
22 preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for  
23 liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal  
24 year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and

1 other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal  
2 lands; ~~\$172,821,000~~ *\$174,521,000*, of which \$5,000,000 for  
3 fighting and preventing forest fires and \$1,910,000 for insect  
4 and disease control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to  
5 section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the  
6 extent necessary under the then existing conditions: *Pro-*  
7 *vided*, That not more than \$2,480,000 of this appropriation  
8 may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March  
9 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513–519): *Provided*  
10 *further*, That funds appropriated for “Cooperative range  
11 improvements”, pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April  
12 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this  
13 appropriation.

14 Forest research: For forest research at forest and range  
15 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-  
16 where, as authorized by law; ~~\$34,955,000~~ *\$38,578,000*.

17 State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation  
18 with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in for-  
19 est tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands,  
20 and in forest management and processing, and for advising  
21 timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and  
22 others in the application of forest management principles and  
23 processing of forest products, as authorized by law; \$17,-  
24 897,000.



1 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
2 AUTHORIZATION)

3 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions  
4 of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relat-  
5 ing to the construction and maintenance of forest develop-  
6 ment roads and trails, \$101,230,000, to remain available  
7 until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pur-  
8 suant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code,  
9 section 203: *Provided*, That funds available under the Act  
10 of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with  
11 and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further*,  
12 That not less than the amount made available under the  
13 provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended  
14 under the provisions of such Act.

15 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

16 SPECIAL ACTS

17 For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil  
18 erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior  
19 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance  
20 with the provisions of the following Acts, authorizing annual  
21 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not  
22 to exceed the following amounts from such receipts, Cache  
23 National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347),  
24 as amended, \$20,000; Uinta and Wasatch National Forests.

1 Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866) , as amended,  
 2 \$20,000; Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada, Act of June 25,  
 3 1938 (52 Stat. 1205) , as amended, \$8,000; Sequoia Na-  
 4 tional Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (54 Stat.  
 5 402) , \$32,000; in all, \$80,000: *Provided*, That no part of  
 6 this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land  
 7 which is not within the boundaries of the national forests  
 8 and/or for the acquisition of any land without the approval  
 9 of the local government concerned.

#### 10 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

11 For the acquisition of land in the Uinta National Forest,  
 12 Utah, in accordance with the Act of October 1, 1965 (79  
 13 Stat. 899) , \$300,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 14 COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

15 For artificial revegetation, construction, and mainte-  
 16 nance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradi-  
 17 cation of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in  
 18 accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16  
 19 U.S.C. 580h) , to be derived from grazing fees as authorized  
 20 by said section, \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 21 ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

22 For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the  
 23 Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16

1 U.S.C. 568e), \$1,000,000, to remain available until  
2 expended.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

4 Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current  
5 fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to  
6 exceed one hundred and sixty-five passenger motor  
7 vehicles of which one hundred and fifteen shall be for  
8 replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and  
9 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed  
10 four for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant  
11 to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act  
12 of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 for  
13 employment under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
14 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as  
15 authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended  
16 (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of  
17 buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a);  
18 (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commis-  
19 sion as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911  
20 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests  
21 therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the  
22 Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

23 Except to provide materials required in or incident to  
24 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic



1 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the  
2 Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine  
3 manufactured from commodities or materials produced out-  
4 side of the United States.

5 Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for  
6 acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act  
7 approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519,  
8 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of an  
9 established national forest or purchase unit.

#### 10 FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

##### 11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety  
13 Board of Review, including services as authorized by section  
14 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
15 \$61,400.

#### 16 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

##### 17 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

18 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing  
19 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including  
20 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and  
21 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Com-  
22 mittee meetings of the Commission either within or outside  
23 the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers ap-  
24 proved by the Commission, \$115,000.

## 1 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## 2 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

## 3 INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

4 For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to  
5 carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68  
6 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed sixteen  
7 passenger motor vehicles, of which twelve shall be for  
8 replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and  
9 aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service  
10 in private residences in the field, when authorized under reg-  
11 ulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set  
12 forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at  
13 facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324,  
14 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; ~~\$73,250,000~~  
15 ~~\$73,671,000~~.

## 16 CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

17 For construction, major repair, improvement, and equip-  
18 ment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quar-  
19 ters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and  
20 drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of port-  
21 able buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic  
22 and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized  
23 by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C.  
24 2004a); ~~\$13,000,000~~ \$13,928,000, to remain available

1 until expended: *Provided*, That such expenditures during the  
2 current or any subsequent fiscal year may, at the option of  
3 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be made  
4 by the Department of the Interior as contracting agent.

5 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

6 ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

7 For carrying out sections 12 and 13 of the National  
8 Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965,  
9 \$1,000,000.

10 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

11 Appropriations contained in this Act, available for  
12 salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as au-  
13 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
14 U.S.C. 55a).

15 Appropriations contained in this Act available for sal-  
16 aries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allow-  
17 ances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954,  
18 as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

19 Appropriations contained in this Act available for  
20 salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of at-  
21 tendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions  
22 or activities for which the appropriation is made or which



1 will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or manage-  
2 ment of those functions or activities.

3 INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
6 Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian  
7 Claims Commission, \$382,000, of which not to exceed  
8 \$10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

9 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National  
12 Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), includ-  
13 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of Au-  
14 gust 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances  
15 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131);  
16 \$1,005,000.

17 NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
20 title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), includ-  
21 ing payment in advance for membership in societies whose  
22 publications or services are available to members only or to  
23 members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of

1 passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances there-  
2 for, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); \$1,400,000.

3 CONSTRUCTION, RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

4 For expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct,  
5 and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the  
6 National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, including  
7 acquisition of rights of way, land and interests therein,  
8 \$9,055,000, to remain available until expended.

9 NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE

10 HUMANITIES

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For expenses necessary to carry out the National  
13 Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965,  
14 including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain  
15 available until expended, ~~\$7,000,000~~ \$9,000,000, of which  
16 ~~\$6,000,000~~ \$4,000,000 shall be available for carrying out  
17 ~~sections 5(e) and section 5(c);~~ \$2,000,000 for carrying out  
18 ~~section 7(c); and~~ \$2,000,000 for carrying out section 5 (h)  
19 of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated  
20 for the purposes of section 11 (b) of the Act, an amount  
21 equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of  
22 money, and other property received by the Endowments,  
23 during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section

1 10 (a) (2) of the Act, but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the  
 2 Endowment for the Arts, and \$3,000,000 for the Endow-  
 3 ment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively  
 4 appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section  
 5 11 (b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966 : *Pro-*  
 6 *vided further, That no funds appropriated pursuant to this*  
 7 *paragraph may be used for any grant or other payment*  
 8 *which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction*  
 9 *of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.*

#### 10 PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

##### 11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Public Land Law Review  
 13 Commission, established by Public Law 88-606, approved  
 14 September 19, 1964, including services as authorized by  
 15 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
 16 and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representa-  
 17 tion expenses, \$907,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 18 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

##### 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution,  
 21 including research; preservation, exhibition, and increase of  
 22 collections from Government and other sources; international  
 23 exchanges; anthropological researches; maintenance of the



1 Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observa-  
2 tions in high altitudes; administration of the National Col-  
3 lection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; in-  
4 cluding not to exceed \$35,000 for services as authorized  
5 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ;  
6 purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and  
7 elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as  
8 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees;  
9 repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and  
10 preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for  
11 publications; ~~\$22,523,000~~ \$22,844,000.

12 ARCHEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND EXCAVATION (SPECIAL  
13 FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

14 For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
15 Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
16 quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses for  
17 carrying out museum programs and related research in the  
18 natural sciences and cultural history under the provisions of  
19 section 104 (k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
20 Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704k),  
21 \$2,316,000, to remain available until expended and to be  
22 available only to United States institutions: *Provided*, That  
23 this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other

1 appropriations to Smithsonian Institution, for payments in  
2 the foregoing currencies.

3 CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL

4 ZOOLOGICAL PARK

5 For necessary expenses of planning, construction, re-  
6 modeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the  
7 National Zoological Park, \$1,589,000, to remain available  
8 until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount  
9 as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of  
10 Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81-84; 75 Stat. 779).

11 RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

12 For necessary expenses of restoration and renovation  
13 of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institu-  
14 tion, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22,  
15 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed \$10,000 for  
16 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
17 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$2,300,000, to remain available  
18 until expended.

19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

20 For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery  
21 of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein,  
22 and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized  
23 by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended

1 by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolu-  
2 tion 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as  
3 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
4 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; payment in advance when authorized by  
5 the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library,  
6 museum, and art associations or societies whose publications  
7 or services are available to members only, or to members  
8 at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair,  
9 and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators  
10 and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as  
11 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; purchase, or rental of  
12 devices and services for protecting buildings and contents  
13 thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches,  
14 and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and  
15 repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by  
16 contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms,  
17 or organizations at such rates or prices and under such  
18 terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper;  
19 ~~\$2,694,000~~ \$2,718,000.

20 CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

22 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of



1 the Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366), as amended,  
2 ~~\$25,000~~ \$35,000.

3 LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Lewis and Clark Trail  
6 Commission, established by Public Law 88-630, approved  
7 October 6, 1964, including services as authorized by section  
8 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$25,000.

9 FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR

10 ALASKA

11 For necessary expenses of the Federal Development  
12 Planning Committees for Alaska, established by Executive  
13 Order 11182 of October 2, 1964, including hire of passenger  
14 motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of  
15 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$190,000.

16 FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

17 For necessary expenses of the Franklin Delano Roose-  
18velt Memorial Commission, established by the Act of Au-  
19gust 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694), \$80,000, to remain available  
20 until expended.

21 GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

22 SEC. 202. The per diem rate paid from appropriations  
23 made available under this title for services as authorized by

1 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) or  
2 other law, shall not exceed \$83.

3 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
5 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the  
6 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

7 This Act may be cited as the “Department of the In-  
8 terior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967.”

Passed the House of Representatives April 6, 1966.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*

Calendar No. 1117

80TH CONGRESS  
2d Session

**H. R. 14215**

[Report No. 1154]

---

## **AN ACT**

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

---

APRIL 13, 1966

Read twice and referred to the Committee on  
Appropriations

MAY 10, 1966

Reported with amendments







# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 13, 1966  
For actions of May 12, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 79

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....12,31	Forest Service.....1	Postal rates.....16
Appropriations.....1	Imports.....45	Poverty.....9,18
Commodity exchanges.....38	Inflation.....5,24	Prices.....43
Consumers.....29	Information.....34	REA.....19
Cotton.....3,20	Lands.....39	Reclamation.....41
Economic council.....43	Legislative program.....30	Recreation.....10
Education.....22,40	Livestock.....28	Research.....7
Electrification.....19	Loan pools.....21,30,35	School milk.....2
Farm labor.....11,22	Minimum wage.....25,30	Stockpiling.....13
Farm prices.....46	Opinion poll.....33	Strip mining.....8
Farm program.....17,32	Packaging.....37	Surplus property.....44
Fees.....10,14,30	Participation sales	Transportation.....15
Flood control.....14	.....21,30,35	Watersheds.....27
Food for freedom.....36	Personnel.....26	Weather.....4
Foreign trade.....6,23,45	Pest control.....42	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed Interior appropriation bill, including Forest Service items. Sen. Proxmire spoke for his school milk bill. Sen. Kuchel spoke for cotton promotion bill. Rep. Randall stated farm prices not causing inflation. Rep. Findley criticized cotton program. Rep. Smith, Iowa commended but recommended changes in farm program and Rep. Skubitz criticized farm program.

## SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, including Forest Service items. The USDA items were the same as reported by committee. Senate conferees were appointed.  
pp. 9908-13
2. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire spoke in favor of his school milk bill, S. 2921, and inserted his testimony. p. 9864



3. COTTON PROMOTION. Sen. Kuchel spoke on the importance of cotton and in favor of H. R. 12322, the cotton promotion bill. pp. 9864-5
4. WEATHER CONTROL. Sen. Magnuson inserted and discussed his amendment in the nature of a substitute for S. 2916, his weather control bill. pp. 9860-2
5. INFLATION. Sen. Bennett inserted Sen. Robertson's address stating that inflation is caused by too much credit and spending. pp. 9867-8
6. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Inouye inserted an article favoring "trade bridges to the East." p. 9870  
Sen. Robertson inserted an address by the President of the Export-Import Bank on its services. pp. 9893-6
7. RESEARCH. Sen. Robertson inserted a letter from Vice Adm. Rickover reviewing the life of George Washington Carver. pp. 9873-4
8. STRIP MINING. Sen. Nelson spoke in favor of his S. 2688 to regulate strip mining. pp. 9880-3
9. POVERTY. Sen. Douglas inserted comments of young people on "the contribution of the Job Corps to the war on poverty." pp. 9899-903
10. RECREATION. Sen. Mundt spoke against fees for admission to reservoir areas. pp. 9913-15
11. FARM LABOR. Sen. Murphy deplored the "crisis" in the supply of labor for the Calif. asparagus crop. pp. 9922-5
12. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 16, when the D. C. revenue bill is to be considered. pp. 9918, 9932

#### HOUSE

13. STOCKPILING. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 13769, to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile (H. Rept. 1527). p. 10029
14. FLOOD CONTROL FEES. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 13313, amended, to prohibit user fees being charged in connection with projects for navigation and flood control (p. D413). The committee was given until midnight May 14 to file a report (p. 9941).
15. TRANSPORTATION. By a vote of 306-27 passed as reported S. 1098, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the freight-car supply. pp. 9942-65
16. POSTAL RATES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 14904, to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail. p. D413
17. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Randall objected to "talk lately that it is the farmers prices that cause inflation." p. 9967  
Rep. Nelsen inserted an article, "Revolt Against Freeman." p. 9979

89TH CONGRESS  
2D SESSION

# H. R. 14215

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 12, 1966

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

1       *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*  
2       *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*  
3       That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money  
4       in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-  
5       ment of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year  
6       ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, namely:

1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
 2 PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

3 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

4 MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

5 For expenses necessary for protection, use, improve-  
 6 ment, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classifica-  
 7 tion, and performance of other functions, as authorized by  
 8 law, in the management of lands and their resources under  
 9 the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management,  
 10 (1) ~~\$48,755,000~~ \$48,970,000.

11 CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

12 For acquisition, construction and maintenance of build-  
 13 ings, appurtenant facilities, and other improvements, and  
 14 maintenance of access roads, (2) ~~\$2,900,000~~ \$3,062,000, to  
 15 remain available until expended.

16 PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

17 (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

18 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
 19 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
 20 203, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended.

21 OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

22 For expenses necessary for management, protection,  
 23 and development of resources and for construction, operation,  
 24 and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other  
 25 improvements on the revested Oregon and California Rail-



1 road grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and  
2 California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent  
3 rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of ex-  
4 isting connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an  
5 amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all  
6 receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested  
7 Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain  
8 available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount ap-  
9 propriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on  
10 lands administered by the Forest Service shall be trans-  
11 ferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture:  
12 *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein for  
13 road construction on lands other than those administered by  
14 the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of  
15 Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*,  
16 That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reim-  
17 bursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant  
18 fund and shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the  
19 Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second  
20 paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August  
21 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

#### 22 RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

23 For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range  
24 improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and  
25 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C.

1 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received  
2 during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees  
3 under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys  
4 received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of  
5 said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements  
6 from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to  
7 the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787,  
8 dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

9 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

10 Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management  
11 shall be available for purchase of one passenger motor  
12 vehicle for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft  
13 for replacement only; purchase, erection, and dismantle-  
14 ment of temporary structures; and alteration and mainte-  
15 nance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to  
16 which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appro-  
17 priations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management  
18 expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and  
19 California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road  
20 grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appro-  
21 priation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be re-  
22 imbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection  
23 (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat.  
24 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and Cali-  
25 fornia land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved

1 May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated  
 2 the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further*,  
 3 That appropriations herein made may be expended on a re-  
 4 imburseable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those  
 5 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management  
 6 and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral re-  
 7 sources for the State of Alaska.

## 8 BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

### 9 EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

10 For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare  
 11 services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with  
 12 States and other organizations, including payment (in ad-  
 13 vance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance,  
 14 and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institu-  
 15 tions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy  
 16 Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of  
 17 rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of  
 18 law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian  
 19 arts and crafts shops: ~~(3) \$114,475,000~~ \$115,061,300: *Pro-*  
 20 *vided*, That not to exceed \$85,000 of this appropriation shall  
 21 be made available to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe  
 22 for maintenance of law and order.

### 23 RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

24 For expenses necessary for management, development,  
 25 improvement, and protection of resources and appurtenant



1 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian  
 2 Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and  
 3 charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian  
 4 industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts  
 5 and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian  
 6 arts and crafts, as authorized by law; \$44,086,000.

## 7 CONSTRUCTION

8 For construction, major repair, and improvement of ir-  
 9 rigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other  
 10 facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; prepa-  
 11 ration of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering  
 12 services by contract; ~~(4)\$55,325,000~~ \$56,848,000, to re-  
 13 main available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the  
 14 sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of  
 15 land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New  
 16 Mexico, South Dakota, and Utah outside of the boundaries of  
 17 existing Indian reservations except lands authorized by law  
 18 to be acquired for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project: *Pro-*  
 19 *vided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be  
 20 used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the  
 21 States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or  
 22 outside the boundaries of existing reservations except such  
 23 lands as may be required for replacement of the Wild Horse  
 24 Dam in the State of Nevada: *Provided further*, That such  
 25 amounts as may be available for the construction of the Nav-

1 ajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bu-  
 2 reau of Reclamation(5): *Provided further, That not to exceed*  
 3 *\$918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico,*  
 4 *School District No. 4 for construction of junior high and high*  
 5 *school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public*  
 6 *School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school.*

7 ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
 8 AUTHORIZATION)

9 For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to au-  
 10 thority contained in title 23, United States Code, section  
 11 203, (6)\$16,754,000 \$16,889,000 to remain available until  
 12 expended.

13 GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

14 For expenses necessary for the general administration  
 15 of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in  
 16 field offices, \$4,623,000.

17 TRIBAL FUNDS

18 In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended  
 19 by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$3,000,000  
 20 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure  
 21 for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay  
 22 and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other  
 23 assistance to Indian children attending public and private  
 24 schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of  
 25 admission) ; purchase of land and improvements on land,

1 title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States  
2 in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and  
3 water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and  
4 other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved  
5 contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers,  
6 councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organiza-  
7 tions, including mileage for use of privately owned automo-  
8 biles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established  
9 administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian  
10 employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without  
11 regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat.  
12 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator  
13 for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the  
14 approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to  
15 the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the  
16 amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced  
17 to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such pur-  
18 poses as may be designated by the governing body of the  
19 particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary:  
20 *Provided further*, That funds derived from appropriations in  
21 satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and  
22 the Court of Claims shall not be available for advances,  
23 except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney  
24 fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program plan-



1   ning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth  
 2   the purposes for which said funds will be used: *Provided,*  
 3   *however,* That no part of this appropriation or other tribal  
 4   funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights  
 5   within the States of Nevada, Oregon, ~~(7)~~and Washington,  
 6   ~~(8)~~and Wyoming; either inside or outside the boundaries of  
 7   existing Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the  
 8   property being exempted from local taxation, except as pro-  
 9   vided for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627) .

#### 10                   ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

11       Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except  
 12   the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of  
 13   motor vehicles (including thirty-five for police-type use  
 14   exhibits; purchase of not to exceed ninety-three passenger  
 15   which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price  
 16   limitation for the current fiscal year) , of which seventy shall  
 17   be for replacement only, which may be used for the trans-  
 18   portation of Indians; advance payments for service (includ-  
 19   ing services which may extend beyond the current fiscal  
 20   year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June  
 21   4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452) , the Act of August 3, 1956 (70  
 22   Stat. 986) , and legislation terminating Federal supervision  
 23   over certain Indian tribes; and expenses required by con-  
 24   tinuing or permanent treaty provisions.

## BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, not otherwise provided for, ~~(9)\$3,910,000~~ \$3,960,000.

## LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), including \$2,560,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal year, and acquisition of land or waters, or interests therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the State or Federal agency concerned, to be derived from the of said Act, and to remain available until expended, not to Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 exceed \$110,000,000 of which (1) not to exceed ~~(10)\$76,-203,000~~ \$65,703,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount; (2) not to exceed ~~(11)\$17,971,000~~ \$23,471,500 shall be available to the National Park Service; (3) not to exceed ~~(12)\$13,093,000~~ \$18,093,000 shall be available to the Forest Service; and (4) not to exceed \$172,500 shall be available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: *Provided*, That in the event the receipts available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund are insufficient to pro-

1 vide the full amounts specified herein, the amounts available  
2 under clauses (1) through (4) shall be reduced propor-  
3 tionately.

#### 4 OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

##### 5 ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

6 For expenses necessary for the administration of Terri-  
7 tories and for the departmental administration of the Trust  
8 Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the  
9 Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices  
10 of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as author-  
11 ized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1661 (c) ) ; salaries of  
12 the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secre-  
13 tary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of the  
14 immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591,  
15 72 Stat. 1095) ; compensation and mileage of members of  
16 the legislature in American Samoa as authorized by law (48  
17 U.S.C. sec. 1661 (c) ) ; compensation and expenses of the  
18 judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48  
19 U.S.C. 1661 (c) ) ; grants to American Samoa, in addition  
20 to current local revenues, for support of governmental func-  
21 tions; loans and grants to Guam, as authorized by law (Pub-  
22 lic Law 88-170) ; and personal services, household equip-  
23 ment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation



1 of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American  
2 Samoa; \$10,513,000, to remain available until expended:  
3 *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein  
4 provided for are authorized to make purchases through the  
5 General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That  
6 appropriations available for the administration of Territories  
7 may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance,  
8 and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official  
9 purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found  
10 by the Secretary to be necessary.

11 TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

12 For expenses necessary for the Department of the In-  
13 terior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
14 Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
15 joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the  
16 Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat.  
17 171), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of  
18 the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and  
19 expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pa-  
20 cific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific  
21 Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of govern-  
22 mental functions; \$17,494,000, to remain available until  
23 expended: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the  
24 Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies  
25 or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust

1 Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting  
2 Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget  
3 and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended,  
4 and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64  
5 Stat. 834) : *Provided further*, That the government of the  
6 Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make  
7 purchases through the General Services Administration:  
8 *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the ad-  
9 ministration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may  
10 be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and  
11 operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes  
12 and for commercial transportation purposes found by the  
13 Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of  
14 article 6 (2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by  
15 Congress.

## 16 ALASKA RAILROAD

### 17 ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

18 The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue  
19 available until expended for the work authorized by law,  
20 including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or  
21 coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with  
22 other branches of the Government service, for the purpose  
23 of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight,  
24 passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit  
25 and development of industries or travel in the area

1 served; and payment of compensation and expenses as  
2 authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916  
3 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided:  
4 *Provided*, That no employee shall be paid an annual salary  
5 out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the  
6 Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS-15,  
7 except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant  
8 general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by  
9 said Act for GS-17, and five officers at not to exceed the  
10 salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS-16.

## 11 MINERAL RESOURCES

### 12 GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

#### 13 SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

14 For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to per-  
15 form surveys, investigations, and research covering topog-  
16 raphy, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the  
17 United States, its Territories and possessions, and other  
18 areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837 and 76 Stat. 427) ;  
19 classify lands as to mineral character and water and power  
20 resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and  
21 Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental  
22 regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases,  
23 permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the inter-  
24 state shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15  
25 U.S.C. 715); administer the minerals exploration program



1 (30 U.S.C. 641) ; and publish and disseminate data rela-  
 2 tive to the foregong activities; ~~(13)\$72,782,000, \$80,932,-~~  
 3 ~~000~~ of which ~~(14)\$12,350,000~~ \$13,250,000 shall be  
 4 available only for cooperation with States or municipalities  
 5 for water resources investigations, and \$216,000 shall re-  
 6 main available until expended, to provide financial assistance  
 7 to participants in minerals exploration projects, as authorized  
 8 by law (30 U.S.C. 641-646), including administration of  
 9 contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section  
 10 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended:  
 11 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used  
 12 to pay more than one-half the cost of any typographic  
 13 mapping or water resources investigations carried on in  
 14 cooperation with any State, or municipality.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

16 The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall  
 17 be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-six pas-  
 18 senger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimburse-  
 19 ment of the General Services Administration for security  
 20 guard service for protection of confidential files; con-  
 21 tracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the  
 22 making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it  
 23 is administratively determined that such procedures are in  
 24 the public interest; construction and maintenance of neces-

1 sary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands  
 2 for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S.  
 3 National Committee on Geology; and payment of compen-  
 4 sation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological  
 5 Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the  
 6 United States in the negotiation and administration of inter-  
 7 state compacts.

## 8 BUREAU OF MINES

### 9 CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL

#### 10 RESOURCES

11 For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation,  
 12 exploration, development, production, and utilization of min-  
 13 eral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Terri-  
 14 tories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and sub-  
 15 stitutes: ~~(15)\$31,540,000~~ *\$34,940,000*.

#### 16 HEALTH AND SAFETY

17 For expenses necessary for promotion of health and  
 18 safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling  
 19 fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law; \$9,390,000.

#### 20 SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

21 For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the  
 22 Secretary of the Interior under the Solid Waste Disposal  
 23 Act, ~~(16)\$4,000,000~~ *\$4,300,000*, to remain available until  
 24 expended.

1        APPALACHIAN REGION MINING AREA RESTORATION

2        For expenses necessary in carrying out a nationwide  
 3 study of strip and surface mine rehabilitation and reclama-  
 4 tion, and a program of mining area restoration, as author-  
 5 ized by section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Develop-  
 6 ment Act of 1965, ~~(17)\$8,000,000~~ \$7,000,000, to remain  
 7 available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation  
 8 shall not be available for the purchase, or for sharing in the  
 9 cost of purchase, of lands or interests therein.

10        GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

11        For expenses necessary for general administration of  
 12 the Bureau of Mines; \$1,556,000.

13        ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

14        Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
 15 Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed  
 16 seventy-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement  
 17 only; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies  
 18 in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Pro-*  
 19 *vided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands,  
 20 buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public  
 21 and private sources and to prosecute projects in coopera-  
 22 tion with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Pro-*  
 23 *vided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized,



1 during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through  
2 any Government agency, including corporations, any metal  
3 or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants  
4 operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such  
5 sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous  
6 receipts.

# HELIUM FUND

8       The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treas-  
9   ury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant  
10  to section 12 (a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960  
11  to carry out the provisions of the Act and contractual obliga-  
12  tions thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain  
13  available without fiscal year limitation, \$26,000,000, in  
14  addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.

## OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the  
18 production and conservation of coal in the United States  
19 through research and development, as authorized by law (74  
20 Stat. 337), \$8,220,000 to remain available until expended,

1 of which not to exceed \$367,000 shall be available for  
2 administration and supervision.

3 OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to dis-  
6 charge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, includ-  
7 ing cooperation with the petroleum industry and State au-  
8 thorities in the production, processing, and utilization of  
9 petroleum and its products, and natural gas, \$722,000.

10 BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

11 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

12 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic  
13 studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection,  
14 and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including  
15 whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products;  
16 collection, compilation, and publication of information con-  
17 cerning such resources; promotion of education and training  
18 of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions  
19 related thereto, as authorized by law; (18)\$20,312,000

1 \$21,076,000, and in addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived  
2 from the Pribilof Islands fund.

3 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

4 (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

5 For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
6 Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
7 quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of  
8 the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as authorized by law,  
9 \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,  
10 That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to  
11 other appropriations to such agency, for payments in the  
12 foregoing currencies.

13 CONSTRUCTION

14 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
15 facilities required for the conservation, management, investi-  
16 gation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery  
17 resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein,  
18 \$1,245,000, to remain available until expended.

19 CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

20 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
21 the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by  
22 the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the  
23 construction of fishing vessels, \$3,000,000, to remain avail-  
24 able until expended.



## FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 197), \$4,710,000, of which not to exceed \$210,000 shall be available for program administration and \$400,000 shall be available until expended pursuant to the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Act: *Provided*, That the sum of \$4,100,000 available for apportionment to the States pursuant to section 5 (a) of the Act shall remain available until the close of the fiscal year following the year for which appropriated.

~~(19)~~ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

## CONSERVATION

*For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000, to remain available until expended.*

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$739,000.

## ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a-631q), there

1 are appropriated amounts not to exceed \$2,468,000, to be  
2 derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

3 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES

4 LOAN FUND

5 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$309,000 of  
6 the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative  
7 expenses.

8 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

9 Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of  
10 Commercial Fisheries shall be available for purchase of not to  
11 exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen  
12 shall be for replacement only (including one for police-type  
13 use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price  
14 limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of one re-  
15 placement aircraft; publication and distribution of bulletins  
16 as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commuta-  
17 tion of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not  
18 to exceed \$3 per man per day; options for the purchase of  
19 land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; and maintenance  
20 and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities  
21 under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries  
22 to which the United States has title, and which are utilized

1 pursuant to law in connection with management and in-  
 2 vestigations of fishery resources.

### 3 BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

#### 4 MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

5 For expenses necessary for scientific and economic  
 6 studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection,  
 7 and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except  
 8 whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of  
 9 other authorized functions related to such resources; opera-  
 10 tion of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard  
 11 National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770) ; and maintenance  
 12 of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains  
 13 Wildlife Refuge; (20)~~\$37,164,000~~ \$39,161,400.

#### 14 CONSTRUCTION

15 For construction and acquisition of buildings and other  
 16 facilities required in the conservation, management, inves-  
 17 tigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wild-  
 18 life resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests  
 19 therein, (21)~~\$5,130,000~~ \$8,341,600, to remain available  
 20 until expended: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance re-  
 21 maining on June 30, 1966, of the appropriation granted  
 22 under this head in the Department of the Interior and Re-



lated Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, shall remain available until expended.

### MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

### APPALACHIAN REGION FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary in carrying out a fish and wildlife restoration program, as authorized by section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, ~~(22)\$1,000,000~~ \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purchase, or for sharing in the cost of purchase, of lands or interests therein.

### ~~(23)~~ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

*For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000, to remain available until expended.*

### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such expenses in the regional offices, ~~(24)\$1,549,000~~ \$1,564,000.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirteen are for replacement only (including sixty-three for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year) ; purchase of not to exceed five aircraft, for replacement only; not to exceed \$50,000 for payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417) ; rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$3 per man per day; insurance on official motor vehicles, aircraft and boats operated by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in foreign countries; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings and other

1 facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Sport Fish-  
 2 eries and Wildlife and to which the United States has title,  
 3 and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with  
 4 management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources.

## 5 NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

### 6 MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

7 For expenses necessary for the management and pro-  
 8 tection of the areas and facilities administered by the Na-  
 9 tional Park Service, including protection of lands in process  
 10 of condemnation; plans, investigations, and studies of the  
 11 recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail  
 12 plans and working drawings) and archeological values in  
 13 river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River  
 14 Basin) ; and not to exceed \$88,000 for the Roosevelt  
 15 Campobello International Park Commission, ~~(25)\$35,694,-~~  
 16 ~~000~~ \$36,171,600.

### 17 MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL 18 FACILITIES

19 For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance,  
 20 and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road  
 21 maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable  
 22 basis) , trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities  
 23 essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to  
 24 law by the National Park Service, \$26,680,000.



## CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; the repair or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason of the use of funds for such purposes; and the acquisition of water rights; ~~(26)\$22,894,000~~ \$23,494,000, to remain available until expended.

PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF  
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, and Great Falls Park, Virginia, except minor roads and trails; and Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia, and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

1                   GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

2           For expenses necessary for general administration of the  
3 National Park Service, including such expenses in the re-  
4 gional offices, \$2,562,000.

5                   ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

6           Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be  
7 available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and  
8 forty-one passenger motor vehicles of which one hundred  
9 and five shall be for replacement only, including not to  
10 exceed seventy-seven for police-type use which may exceed  
11 by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the  
12 current fiscal year.

13                   OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

14                   SALARIES AND EXPENSES

15           For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the  
16 Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951-1958),  
17 authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for bene-  
18 ficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended,  
19 \$27,500,000, of which not to exceed \$1,445,000, shall be  
20 available for administration and coordination during the  
21 current fiscal year.

22                   OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

23           For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants  
24 for the production of water suitable for agricultural, indus-

1 trial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as  
 2 authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended,  
 3 (42 U.S.C. 1958a-1958g), \$2,351,000, of which not to  
 4 exceed \$206,000 shall be available for administration.

#### 5 OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

#### 6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions  
 8 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat.  
 9 329), \$6,894,000, of which not to exceed \$431,000 shall  
 10 be available for administrative expenses.

#### 11 OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

#### 12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor,  
 14 ~~(27)\$4,650,000~~ \$4,704,000, and in addition, not to exceed  
 15 \$152,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appro-  
 16 priation from other accounts available to the Department  
 17 of the Interior: *Provided*, That hereafter hearing officers  
 18 appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed  
 19 pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat.  
 20 237), as amended.

#### 21 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

#### 22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of  
 24 the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not



1 to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation  
2 expenses, ~~(28)\$4,984,100~~ \$5,051,700.

3 GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

4 SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be  
5 available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or  
6 office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emer-  
7 gency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft,  
8 buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged  
9 or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable  
10 causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available  
11 under this authority until funds specifically made available  
12 to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have  
13 been exhausted.

14 SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure  
15 or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropria-  
16 tion in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the  
17 budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression  
18 or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or  
19 threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of  
20 the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this  
21 title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the  
22 payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal  
23 year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for  
24 destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in con-  
25 nection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such

1 reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently  
2 available at the time of receipt thereof.

3 SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be  
4 available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and  
5 similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will con-  
6 tribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall  
7 be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity  
8 in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30,  
9 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for  
10 costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services  
11 rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the  
12 time such reimbursements are received.

13 SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of  
14 the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appro-  
15 priations Act, 1967, shall be available for services as  
16 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5  
17 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, in total  
18 amount not to exceed \$200,000; hire, maintenance and  
19 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; pur-  
20 chase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private  
21 residences in the field, when authorized under regulations  
22 approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when  
23 authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in  
24 societies or associations which issue publications to members

1 only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who  
2 are not members.

3 SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department  
4 of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for  
5 uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5  
6 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4-204).

## 7 TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

### 8 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### 9 FOREST SERVICE

#### 10 FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

11 For expenses necessary for forest protection and utiliza-  
12 tion, as follows:

13 Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the  
14 Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the  
15 administration, improvement, development, and management  
16 of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and  
17 preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for  
18 liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal  
19 year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and  
20 other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal  
21 lands; ~~(29)\$172,821,000~~ \$174,521,000, of which \$5,000,-  
22 000 for fighting and preventing forest fires and \$1,910,000  
23 for insect and disease control shall be apportioned for use,  
24 pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended,



1 to the extent necessary under the then existing conditions:  
 2 *Provided*, That not more than \$2,480,000 of this appropria-  
 3 tion may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of  
 4 March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519) : *Provided*  
 5 *further*, That funds appropriated for "Cooperative range  
 6 improvements", pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April  
 7 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this  
 8 appropriation.

9 Forest research: For forest research at forest and range  
 10 experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or else-  
 11 where, as authorized by law ; ~~(30)\$34,955,000~~ \$38,578,000.

12 State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation  
 13 with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in for-  
 14 est tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands,  
 15 and in forest management and processing, and for advising  
 16 timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and  
 17 others in the application of forest management principles and  
 18 processing of forest products, as authorized by law ; \$17,-  
 19 897,000.

20 FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT  
 21 AUTHORIZATION)

22 For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions  
 23 of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relat-  
 24 ing to the construction and maintenance of forest develop-

1 ment roads and trails, \$101,230,000, to remain available  
2 until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pur-  
3 suant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code,  
4 section 203: *Provided*, That funds available under the Act  
5 of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with  
6 and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further*,  
7 That not less than the amount made available under the  
8 provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended  
9 under the provisions of such Act.

10 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS

11 SPECIAL ACTS

12 For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil  
13 erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior  
14 boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance  
15 with the provisions of the following Acts, authorizing annual  
16 appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not  
17 to exceed the following amounts from such receipts, Cache  
18 National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347),  
19 as amended, \$20,000; Uinta and Wasatch National Forests.  
20 Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended,  
21 \$20,000; Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada, Act of June 25,  
22 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), as amended, \$8,000; Sequoia Na-  
23 tional Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (54 Stat.  
24 402), \$32,000; in all, \$80,000: *Provided*, That no part of  
25 this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land

1 which is not within the boundaries of the national forests  
2 and/or for the acquisition of any land without the approval  
3 of the local government concerned.

#### 4 ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

5 For the acquisition of land in the Uinta National Forest,  
6 Utah, in accordance with the Act of October 1, 1965 (79  
7 Stat. 899), \$300,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 8 COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

9 For artificial revegetation, construction, and mainte-  
10 nance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradi-  
11 cation of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in  
12 accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16  
13 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized  
14 by said section, \$700,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 15 ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

16 For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the  
17 Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16  
18 U.S.C. 568e), \$1,000,000, to remain available until  
19 expended.

#### 20 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

21 Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current  
22 fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to  
23 exceed one hundred and sixty-five passenger motor  
24 vehicles of which one hundred and fifteen shall be for



1 replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and  
2 maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed  
3 four for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant  
4 to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the Organic Act  
5 of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 for  
6 employment under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
7 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as  
8 authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended  
9 (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of  
10 buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a);  
11 (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commis-  
12 sion as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911  
13 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests  
14 therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the  
15 Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a).

16 Except to provide materials required in or incident to  
17 research or experimental work where no suitable domestic  
18 product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the  
19 Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine  
20 manufactured from commodities or materials produced out-  
21 side of the United States.

22 Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for  
23 acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act  
24 approved March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519,

1 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of an  
2 established national forest or purchase unit.

3 FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety  
6 Board of Review, including services as authorized by section  
7 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
8 \$61,400.

9 COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing  
12 a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including  
13 payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and  
14 secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Com-  
15 mittee meetings of the Commission either within or outside  
16 the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers ap-  
17 proved by the Commission, \$115,000.

18 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

19 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

20 INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

21 For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to  
22 carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68  
23 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed sixteen  
24 passenger motor vehicles, of which twelve shall be for

1 replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and  
 2 aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service  
 3 in private residences in the field, when authorized under reg-  
 4 ulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set  
 5 forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at  
 6 facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322 (d), 324,  
 7 and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; ~~(31)\$73,250,-~~  
 8 ~~000~~ \$73,671,000.

#### 9 CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

10 For construction, major repair, improvement, and equip-  
 11 ment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quar-  
 12 ters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and  
 13 drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of port-  
 14 able buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic  
 15 and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized  
 16 by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C.  
 17 2004a) ; ~~(32)\$13,000,000~~ \$13,928,000, to remain available  
 18 until expended: *Provided*, That such expenditures during the  
 19 current or any subsequent fiscal year may, at the option of  
 20 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be made  
 21 by the Department of the Interior as contracting agent.



## OFFICE OF EDUCATION

## ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

For carrying out sections 12 and 13 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, \$1,000,000.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities.

## 1 INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

## 2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the  
4 Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian  
5 Claims Commission, \$382,000, of which not to exceed  
6 \$10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

## 7 NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## 8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National  
10 Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), includ-  
11 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of Au-  
12 gust 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances  
13 therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131);  
14 \$1,005,000.

## 15 NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

## 16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
18 title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), includ-  
19 ing payment in advance for membership in societies whose  
20 publications or services are available to members only or to  
21 members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of  
22 passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances there-  
23 for, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); \$1,400,000.

## CONSTRUCTION, RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

For expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct, and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, including acquisition of rights of way, land and interests therein, \$9,055,000, to remain available until expended.

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain available until expended, ~~(33)\$7,000,000~~ \$9,000,000, of which ~~(34)\$6,000,000~~ \$4,000,000 shall be available for carrying out ~~(35)sections 5(e) and section 5(c)~~(36); \$2,000,000 for carrying out section 7(c)(37); and \$2,000,000 for carrying out section 5(h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11(b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devices of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10(a)(2) of the Act, but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for



1 the Arts, and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Hu-  
 2 manities, less the amounts respectively appropriated to such  
 3 Endowments for the purposes of section 11 (b) in the Sup-  
 4 plemental Appropriation Act, 1966(38): *Provided further,*  
 5 *That no funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph may*  
 6 *be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used*  
 7 *directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan*  
 8 *Opera House in New York City.*

#### 9 PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

##### 10 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

11 For necessary expenses of the Public Land Law Review  
 12 Commission, established by Public Law 88-606, approved  
 13 September 19, 1964, including services as authorized by  
 14 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),  
 15 and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representa-  
 16 tion expenses, \$907,000, to remain available until expended.

#### 17 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

##### 18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution,  
 20 including research; preservation, exhibition, and increase of  
 21 collections from Government and other sources; international  
 22 exchanges; anthropological researches; maintenance of the  
 23 Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observa-  
 24 tions in high altitudes; administration of the National Col-

1 lection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; in-  
 2 cluding not to exceed \$35,000 for services as authorized  
 3 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ;  
 4 purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and  
 5 elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as  
 6 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees;  
 7 repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and  
 8 preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for  
 9 publications: ~~(39)\$22,523,000~~ \$22,844,000.

10     ARCHIEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND EXCAVATION (SPECIAL  
 11                             FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

12         For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury  
 13 Department shall determine to be excess to the normal re-  
 14 quirements of the United States, for necessary expenses for  
 15 carrying out museum programs and related research in the  
 16 natural sciences and cultural history under the provisions of  
 17 section 104 (k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and  
 18 Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704k),  
 19 \$2,316,000, to remain available until expended and to be  
 20 available only to United States institutions: *Provided*, That  
 21 this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other  
 22 appropriations to Smithsonian Institution, for payments in  
 23 the foregoing currencies.

1           CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL  
2                           ZOOLOGICAL PARK

3       For necessary expenses of planning, construction, re-  
4 modeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the  
5 National Zoological Park, \$1,589,000, to remain available  
6 until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount  
7 as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of  
8 Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81-84; 75 Stat. 779) .

9           RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

10       For necessary expenses of restoration and renovation  
11 of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institu-  
12 tion, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22,  
13 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed \$10,000 for  
14 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August  
15 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) , \$2,300,000, to remain available  
16 until expended.

17       SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

18       For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery  
19 of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein,  
20 and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized  
21 by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended  
22 by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolu-  
23 tion 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as



1 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946  
 2 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; payment in advance when authorized by  
 3 the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library,  
 4 museum, and art associations or societies whose publications  
 5 or services are available to members only, or to members  
 6 at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair,  
 7 and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators  
 8 and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as  
 9 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; purchase, or rental of  
 10 devices and services for protecting buildings and contents  
 11 thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches,  
 12 and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and  
 13 repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by  
 14 contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms,  
 15 or organizations at such rates or prices and under such  
 16 terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper;  
 17 ~~(40)\$2,694,000~~ \$2,718,000.

## 18 CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

### 19 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

20 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of  
 21 the Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366), as amended,  
 22 ~~(41)\$25,000~~ \$35,000.

## LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, established by Public Law 88-630, approved October 6, 1964, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$25,000.

FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR  
ALASKA

For necessary expenses of the Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska, established by Executive Order 11182 of October 2, 1964, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$190,000.

## FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, established by the Act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694), \$80,000, to remain available until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 202. The per diem rate paid from appropriations made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) or other law, shall not exceed \$83.

## 1 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in  
3 this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the  
4 current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

5 This Act may be cited as the “Department of the In-  
6 terior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967.”

Passed the House of Representatives April 6, 1966.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

*Clerk.*

Passed the Senate with amendments May 12, 1966.

Attest:

EMERY L. FRAZIER,

*Secretary.*



89TH CONGRESS  
2D Session

H. R. 14215

---

## AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

---

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MAY 12, 1966

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the  
Senate numbered

cost \$10 a person, he has learned, and it may not always be easy to obtain a written record of the expense. When the agent returns to the audit, he has had an education in business expenditures.

In addition to collecting revenue and deterring cheating, the audit system is supposed to have the function of boosting the morale of the honest taxpayer. He needs to be assured that he will not, relatively speaking, be penalized for his honesty. One of the gnawing resentments of April 15 is the feeling that Joe Twerp has been getting away with murder. The majority of taxpayers, though they wail, are willing to pay what they owe (or most of it) provided everybody else does, too. But that is the rub. Many taxpayers who have been audited are not persuaded that the law has been applied fairly to them. The IRS is the only branch of government in which the basic assumption of Anglo-American jurisprudence—that a man is innocent until proved guilty—does not fully apply. By law, a deduction is subject to disallowance until it is proved allowable.

To some extent, this attitude is understandable. Some taxpayers ask agents to believe pretty farfetched stories. A man who had canceled checks showing \$90 in contributions to his church claimed he had also given \$1,000 in cash. A man who kept receipted bills for entertainment expense down to \$2 and \$3 claimed he also spent \$4,000 without getting receipts. It could be true, but the agent can be forgiven for being skeptical.

Sometimes the taxpayer's records may be accurate, but he is unable to prove it; or perhaps he does not have complete records and has had to estimate. This is no longer permissible in all cases. The old "Cohan rule" of reasonability—that an entertainment expense was allowable if it was reasonable under the circumstances—has been replaced by a requirement that every item over \$25 must be substantiated by a receipted bill. These new travel and expenses regulations, which went into force on December 31, 1962, have not yet been tested in the courts, but they are being strictly applied.

The taxpayer may approach the audit in a difficult frame of mind. Some panic, and prepare for disaster. Others become belligerent and self-righteous, ready to take on the Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court as well as the IRS. Still others try desperately to pull political strings, an effort that is usually highly counterproductive.

When the examination occurs, it sometimes is almost anticlimactic. The taxpayer finds he is not being summoned to court for commission of a crime; he may arrange the appointment at a convenient time. He need not go to the IRS with his papers and other records stuffed into a suitcase or a trunk. If the data involved are voluminous, the agent is willing to come to him. The agent is authorized to take into account evidence of a taxpayer's good faith, and need not check every minute detail—though some do. He has instructions to be courteous and fair.

#### ROUGH SAILING

If the agent is indeed reasonable and the taxpayer well prepared, the audit can be over in a few hours—a day at most. If the return is complicated, the records incomplete, and/or the agent difficult, it can drag on and on. It is then that it becomes an affliction. If in addition to being difficult, the agent misapplies the law, then the taxpayer really needs a friend.

A man who used a 23-foot sailboat for entertaining business contacts deducted half the expenses on his return. He was audited, and the agent, a man in his twenties, expressed much concern about the deduction. He inquired in detail about personal use of the boat, and was shown records in a diary indicating that such use occurred less than

half of the time. He asked for, and obtained, corroborative evidence that business discussions had taken place on board. He studied a record of who went sailing, and saw proof that the entertainment had led to production of income. Nevertheless, he disallowed the deduction.

Lots of people have boats on Long Island Sound, he said, and in most cases they are strictly for personal use. The taxpayer's boat must also have been largely personal. It was too expensive to have been bought primarily for business. Did the taxpayer's wife go along on the trips? She did? Then it obviously was personal. The taxpayer argued that the presence or absence of a business discussion was the test, not the presence or absence of a spouse. The agent pulled out a copy of the Internal Revenue Service regulations (a large volume) and quoted from regulation 1.274-2(e)(4)(b): "Any use of [an entertainment] facility (of a type described in this subdivision) during one calendar day shall be considered to constitute a 'day of business use' if the primary use of the facility on such day was ordinary and necessary within the meaning of section 162 or 212 and the regulations thereunder."

"For the purposes of this subdivision, a facility shall be deemed to have been primarily used for such purposes on any one calendar day if the facility was used for the conduct of a substantial and bona fide business discussion (as described in paragraph (d)(3)(i) of this section) notwithstanding that the facility may also have been used on the same day for personal or family use by the taxpayer or any member of the taxpayer's family not involving entertainment of others by, or under the authority of the taxpayer."

The agent repeatedly quoted the phrase "not involving the entertainment of others." Relating it to the earlier part of the paragraph, rather than the portion in which it occurred, he said it meant that if others were present at the time the business entertainment took place the facility at that time was not being used for business purposes.

The fact that this interpretation was directly at variance with other regulations did not disturb him. No amount of argument could shake him from this extraordinary distortion of logic, of the law, and of the English language. It developed that the agent's personal philosophy was that all entertainment was a form of bribery; that business should be obtained strictly on its merits, so that the IRS really ought to disallow all entertainment expense.

It seemed that the taxpayer had no option but to bow or go to the prohibitive expense of an appeal. Then, when he was just about at the end of his tether, the agent suddenly reconsidered and allowed the expense.

#### THE OMBUDSMAN IDEA

The appeal procedure, spokesmen for the commissioner say, is really not very difficult or expensive. They claim that the district conference, the first step, is just an informal discussion, with a friendly, experienced official—the father image again—who does not represent either the government or the taxpayer but is seeking pure and objective justice. The taxpayer doesn't need professional advice, they contend; he is in good hands. All this, however, is somehow at variance with the experience of most taxpayers who go "to conference." They regard it as a highly formal, even quasi-judicial proceeding, requiring extensive preparation, including legal briefs and affidavits; and they have little inclination to accept at face value the conferee's detachment and objectivity. He is, after all, an employee of the IRS.

Recently there have been some proposals for the creation of tax review boards, consisting of one or more experienced, well-paid specialists, to protect taxpayers from questionable rulings by the IRS. There is a kind

of precedent in the Ombudsman system in force in Scandinavian countries and in New Zealand. The Ombudsman, a widely respected individual of national stature, is appointed by Parliament to guard against infringement of established rights. Any individual or group may petition him for relief, and he has extensive power to provide it. He may be removed by Parliament but is otherwise wholly independent. In the United States, Representative HENRY REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and Senator CLAI-BORNE PELL, Democrat, of Rhode Island, have proposed a not dissimilar plan for "administrative counsel," an employee of Congress who would investigate and seek to correct citizens' grievances, whether against the IRS or any other branch of government, when asked to do so by a Senator or a Representative. The bill was referred to the Rules Committee in February, 1965, and little has been heard from it since.

More recently, Senators WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat of Washington, and EDWARD LONG, Democrat of Missouri, have mapped out a plan for a nationwide system of small-claims tax commissioners, under the aegis of the tax courts, to whom citizens could bring disputes with the IRS without the expense and formality of court procedure. Two commissioners would be appointed for each of the eleven regions into which the IRS has divided the United States. People who could not afford to hire legal help would be entitled to go to the commissioner, just as they now can go to small-claims court with other kinds of legal disputes involving amounts up to a few hundred dollars.

Commissioners or boards of this type are urgently needed. They should exist primarily to protect taxpayers' rights. The IRS could be forbidden to appeal their decisions if the taxpayer, for his part, also agreed in advance to accept the decision as binding. What would result would be analogous to binding arbitration.

No doubt there would be snags to be ironed out in practice. Safeguards might be needed against frivolous use of the boards. A taxpayer who appealed to them against the decisions of an agent and had his obligations to the Government affirmed, or even increased, might have to assume the costs of the action—the costs, however, being scaled in proportion to his income, so that the poor could afford the risk as easily as the rich.

If the taxpayer's obligations were reduced by the board, the government ought to be assessed for costs, a procedure calculated to inhibit arbitrary and ill-founded IRS rulings in the first instance. With such revenue the boards could be largely self-supporting, and they would greatly ease the case load under which many tax courts are staggering. (At the end of fiscal 1965, 10,765 cases were pending, about a 2-year backlog.)

The possibility of a simple and inexpensive appeal from a tax audit would do much to restore public confidence. Taxpayers who lost would be more likely to swallow the judgment with good grace, less haunted by the suspicion of injustice, less determined to get their money back. The effect on the attitudes and behavior of agents might also be healthy. They would be under pressure to be right, as opposed to pressure to be tough. If they were proved wrong, the government would have to pay costs. To a far greater extent than at present, prestige and advancement within the IRS would logically derive from being infrequently overruled. The balance of bargaining power between taxpayer and agent during the initial audit would be restored.

What are involved are some of the textbook precepts of American democracy—that the government is a government of laws, not of men; that no citizen is ever at the mercy of an official; that if an official exceeds his authority, there must be effective remedies.



available. This is the way the tax system is supposed to operate today, but a sizable number of American taxpayers doubt it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the article by Mr. William R. Frye will indicate what we are talking about in this bill. I suppose I could have found literally hundreds of cases similar to the ones I suggested which took place in Birmingham. I know that if I went through my files accumulated over the years, there would be literally hundreds of such cases there. This is true of every Senator.

This proposed legislation provides an opportunity for the small taxpayer to be heard. I do not think it will deplete any money which might otherwise go into the Treasury. These amounts represent only a small part of the revenue receipts of the country. But the main thing is to relieve the harassing of the small taxpayer who does not know where to go or what to do.

He surely has a right because the American people are probably the most responsible people in the world in paying their just taxes. No other country has a record of tax collections, as does the United States.

But we do want the taxes to be just and we do want to provide an opportunity for the little fellow to come in and set forth his case before someone who would be more appropriate than the agency which is trying to collect the tax.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his excellent statement, and I join him in sponsoring this important piece of legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may be recognized for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. President, the Internal Revenue Service was created to collect taxes, and this it does and well.

Our tax laws and regulations are a maze through which only the tax lawyers, accountants, and the IRS can find their way. The ordinary citizen is lost. Yet this ordinary citizen files the vast bulk of the income tax returns the IRS receives each year.

In preparing his return, this citizen is often at the mercy of the IRS for advice, the same IRS responsible for collecting as much in the way of taxes that it can.

The total amount of tax this citizen will have to pay would usually be less than \$1,500 or \$2,000. If there is a dispute over how much is owed, it is usually not too large—a few hundred dollars at the most—sometimes only \$25 or \$50, but still a significant amount to the small taxpayer.

If there is a dispute and his return is audited, it is the IRS who decides what deductions and credits to allow. If the

taxpayer decides to appeal the result of his audit, he again appeals to the IRS—this time to a regional commissioner.

If his appeal fails, he has the option of taking his case to the U.S. Tax Court, where he reaches the first impartial arbiter in the whole process.

But when \$25 or \$50 is at stake—or even \$150, it does not pay to appeal an audit decision. Tax lawyers say that at least \$200 has to be involved before the taxpayer can gain anything even if his appeal is successful. His cost for a lawyer and probably an accountant, will be too great. For the same reason, unless \$1,500 or \$2,000 is involved, it does not pay to take the case on to the tax court.

So, we are left with the average taxpayer at the mercy of the IRS, which, no matter how much it maintains that it does its work carefully, still has a vested interest in the outcome of each case.

The legislation introduced here today, as the Senator from Washington explained, would allow the small taxpayer to go before an impartial arbiter, at a much lower level. Besides allowing an impartial decision on these small cases, creation of this small Tax Division of the Tax Court would instill in the IRS the desire to win its argument before one of the new Commissioners. This would provide a much-needed check within the IRS.

Mr. President, it is high time we gave a break to the average taxpayer who can not afford to duel with the Internal Revenue Service.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for having introduced the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington for his interesting suggestion.

I have one or two thoughts in regard to the suggestion of the Senator. There is great discussion in this Nation about a program that started in Sweden some years ago. It concerns what known as the ombudsman, a man who deals with people who have small problems and difficulties, and obviates the necessity of their going into courts.

In my opinion, this proposal sounds like a tax ombudsman and it might have merit.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is exactly what it is.

I do not have the figures with me. However, the deficiencies that Internal Revenue tries to collect, or for which they send a bill to the small taxpayer, are very small. Perhaps the Government is correct, but the taxpayer is hon-

est and he says, "I want to go in and find out."

I suspect that the Commissioner may find error here and there. I do not believe it would hurt the Treasury at all.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for purposes of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, to strike out "\$48,755,000" and insert "\$48,970,000".

On page 2, line 14, after the word "roads", to strike out "\$2,900,000" and insert "\$3,062,000".

On page 6, line 1, after the word "shops", to strike out "\$114,475,000" and insert "\$115,061,300".

On page 6, line 19, after the word "contract", to strike out "\$55,325,000" and insert "\$56,848,000", and on page 7, line 10, after the word "Reclamation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

"Provided further, That not to exceed \$918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico, School District No. 4 for construction of junior high and high school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school."

On page 7, line 19, after "section 203", to strike out "\$16,754,000" and insert "\$16,889,000".

On page 9, line 14, after the name "Oregon", to insert "and", and in the same line, after the name "Washington", to strike out "and Wyoming".

On page 10, line 14, after the word "for", to strike out "\$3,910,000" and insert "\$3,960,000".

On page 11, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$76,203,000" and insert "\$65,703,000"; in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$17,971,500" and insert "\$23,471,500", and at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "\$13,093,000" and insert "\$18,093,000".

On page 15, line 17, after the word "activities", to strike out "\$72,782,000" and insert "\$80,932,000", and in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "\$12,350,000" and insert "\$13,250,000".

On page 17, line 10, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "\$31,540,000" and insert "\$34,940,000".

On page 17, line 18, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$4,300,000".

On page 18, line 2, after the numerals "1965", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$7,000,000".

On page 20, line 12, after the word "law", to strike out "\$20,312,000" and insert "\$21,076,000".

On page 22, after line 5, to insert:



ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES  
CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 24, line 14, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "\$37,164,000" and insert "\$39,161,400".

On page 24, line 20, after the word "therein", to strike out "\$5,130,000" and insert "\$8,341,600".

On page 25, line 15, after the numerals "1965", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$500,000".

At the top of page 26, to insert:

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES  
CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000, to remain available until expended.

On page 26, line 9, after the word "offices", to strike out "\$1,549,000" and insert "\$1,564,000".

On page 28, line 1, after the word "Commission", to strike out "\$35,694,000" and insert "\$36,171,600".

On page 28, line 19, after the word "rights", to strike out "\$22,894,000" and insert "\$23,494,000".

On page 31, at the beginning of line 12, to strike out "\$4,650,000" and insert "\$4,704,000".

On page 32, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "\$4,984,100" and insert "\$5,051,700".

On page 35, line 2, after the word "lands", to strike out "\$172,821,000" and insert "\$174,521,000".

On page 35, line 16, after the word "law", to strike out "\$34,955,000" and insert "\$38,578,000".

On page 40, line 14, after the word "Act", to strike out "\$73,250,000" and insert "\$73,671,000".

On page 40, line 24, after "(42 U.S.C. 2004a)", to strike out "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$13,928,000".

On page 43, line 15, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$9,000,000"; at the beginning of line 16, to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000"; at the beginning of line 17, to strike out "sections 5 (c) and" and insert "section 5 (c); \$2,000,000 for carrying out section 7 (c); and \$2,000,000 for carrying out section"; and on page 44, line 5, after "1966" to insert a colon and "Provided further, That no funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph may be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City."

On page 45, line 11, after the word "publications", to strike out "\$22,523,000" and insert "\$22,844,000".

On page 47, line 19, to strike out "\$2,694,000" and insert "\$2,718,000".

On page 48, line 2, to strike out "\$25,000" and insert "\$35,000".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates in the amount of \$1,340,260,500, including indefinite appropriations of receipts, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 2 of the report. Excluded from this bill are the South-eastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The committee recommends definite appropriations of \$1,329,755,000. This is \$34,585,500 more than the House allowance; and is \$10,505,500 less than the

budget estimates. Included in the amount over the House allowance is \$10,300,000 in a budget estimate sent directly to the Senate and not considered by the House. This request pertains to exploration for and development of technology for recovery of heavy metals.

The committee recommended the following major increases over the House allowances:

Bureau of Land Management, \$377,000; Bureau of Indian Affairs, \$2,244,300, which will provide a full educational construction program to get greater numbers of Indian children in more adequate schools; Geological Survey, \$8,150,000 and Bureau of Mines, \$2,700,000. All but \$250,000 of the increases for the latter two agencies are for the heavy metals program.

The amount proposed for the land and water conservation fund is \$110 million, as requested in the budget and as allowed by the House.

It is the committee's recommendation that the amount to be available for matching on an equal basis by the States should be held closely to the 60 percent set forth in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The report states on page 10:

Because of the numerous purchases which have recently been authorized for Federal recreational facilities it appears desirable to the committee that the maximum amount possible be made available to accomplish these purchases. This is especially necessary, it is felt by the committee, in view of rapidly rising land prices.

Of the budget estimate, \$10 million was proposed for the Redwood National Park in California. Legislation to establish this Park has been introduced only recently, and no action has yet been taken. The committee recommends increasing funds for the Park Service and Forest Service by \$5 million each and would distribute these amounts to reinstate planned acquisitions from which they were taken in order to allow funds for the Redwood Park. This will make available the following increases, among other additions: \$500,000 for Assateague Island National Seashore in the State of Maryland; \$500,000 for Minute Man Historic Park; \$2,339,500 for Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area; \$1 million for Fire Island National Seashore; and \$250,000 for Whiskeytown-Shasta-Trinity National Recreation Area.

The committee also has recommended increases over the House allowance of \$3,439,000 for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and \$7,399,000 for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. Almost half of the total increases for these two agencies is for initiating activity under the Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries and Conservation Act which became law last October 30, and which by its terms will terminate in 1970. It was for this reason that the Senate committee added these two items to the bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives.

The remainder of the additional funds are for predatory animal control and for advancement of the commercial and sport fishery activities of the United States.

For the National Park Service there is an increase of \$1,077,600. For the Forest Service the committee proposes increases amounting to \$5,323,000, of which over 68 percent is for research.

It is recommended that the Division of Indian Health be financed at a sum \$1,349,000 greater than the amount provided by the House of Representatives. However, \$748,000 of this increase is a restoration of the House disallowance of a portion of the budget estimate for construction of sanitation facilities.

The House of Representatives declined, without prejudice, to allow any of the budget request of the National Endowment for the Humanities; and stated its "understanding that it may be taken up at a later date by the Senate." This was done, and a complete hearing was held as to the items which had not been considered or allowed by the House of Representatives. The committee proposes an appropriation of \$2 million.

It is the opinion of the committee that the changes which are recommended provide for activities helpful in the development of the resources of our country and will broaden the base of the Nation's economy.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President—

Mr. BIBLE. May I first yield to the Senator from South Dakota? He is the ranking member of the Republican Party on the Appropriations Interior Subcommittee. He has performed yeoman service and has been extremely helpful in molding and developing the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator.

I congratulate the acting chairman of the subcommittee for his presentation this morning and the thoroughness with which the bill has been considered. The hearings in connection with the proposed legislation consist of 2,200 pages. This little volume of 920 pages, which I hold in my hand, is just a digest of the various items that are included. Every item has been scrutinized carefully, and I am happy to report that the bill in its present form has the unanimous approval of the minority and the majority members of the committee. Also, it received the unanimous approval of the full committee.

I am happy to report that the total amount of the items involved is still \$10,505,000 below the budget estimates for the coming fiscal year. We do not pretend that every department that had a meritorious project has received all the money it would like. That is impossible. But we do think that it is fair. I believe the committee has run a taut ship. It has scrutinized these items very carefully, and we believe that the passage of the proposed legislation in its present form will be beneficial to America.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. He has been extremely helpful in developing the bill in its present form. As the Senator knows, more than 170 amendments were considered in subcommittee, which indicates the wide range of interest that was expressed by the various people who appeared before the committee.



I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

I notice that the bill includes an item of \$200,000 for the Fort Scott National Historic Site. I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee and the members of the committee for retaining this item, which was placed in the bill in the House.

The Fort Scott National Historic Site is one of the truly historic sites in the State of Kansas. It was authorized as a park site in a prior session of Congress.

The National Park Service last year set aside \$50,000 for preliminary studies and planning, and the additional fund will enable the program to begin.

I assure the Senator from Nevada that not only the communities surrounding the Fort Scott National Park Site, but also the State of Kansas, appreciate this action.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the sentiments of the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

This is an important historic site. I am familiar with the enabling legislation. I am delighted that the Senate has concurred with the House action. This will permit the program to go forward without delay.

I yield now to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the United States will be a better and stronger Nation because of the money that will be spent under the proposed appropriation.

The distinguished Senator from South Dakota was correct when he stated that every item that appears in the bill was examined with diligence and with care, after adequate testimony was heard. As a member of the subcommittee, I can attest that this is also true with reference to the many proposed amendments. They were considered, and when it was in the public interest and whenever the budgetary situation would permit, the committee moved affirmatively.

On a more local basis, perhaps, I should like to record by view that the committee acted wisely in adding to the bill \$100,000 so that a mental health team may be organized by the U.S. Public Health Service for the benefit of the native people of Alaska. The native people are the Aleuts, the Eskimos, and the Indians.

As I recall, this program was initiated in South Dakota, and it has worked very well, leading the executive department of the Government to suggest that it be extended to Alaska. The committee agreed with this.

I was made happy by the action of the committee in adding money in certain situations to the budget request for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries. For example, there is a program of Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development, a legislative act that has a life of only 5 years. The legislation provides a Federal appropriation annually of \$5 million, so that all States in which they do not now exist may attempt to develop commercial fisheries, and the

program can be expanded in States that now have such a program.

The budget request was only \$3,210,000. The House, in its wisdom, increased this to \$4,710,000. The latter amount was agreed to by the Senate committee, and that is the amount now in the bill.

As the acting chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, has already noted, the committee added \$2,675,000 to the budget of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for the Great Lakes Fishery and for the sports fisheries, anadromous fish.

This is in response to legislation of last year. The United States has slipped from the position of second in respect to fisheries to fifth place among the maritime nations of the world. It is behind Peru, Red China, Soviet Russia, and Japan. We do need additional assistance to build up our commercial fisheries.

In this connection I should like to note that the committee has incorporated in the bill the sum of \$100,000 for an expanded investigation of the Pacific hake fishery program off the coasts of Washington and Oregon. Hake were discovered there in great numbers by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries very recently. This offers the United States a splendid opportunity, which it has not had until now, of moving out of its coastal waters and into the offshore fishery industry which is dominated now on the west coast by Japan and Soviet Russia.

It is hoped and believed that the hake and pollack, which are found in Alaska in great numbers, will provide the basis for the establishment in this country of plants to produce fish protein. If this is done, as it can be done, the United States will then move into a much higher position in the fishing industry.

The committee added funds for shrimp research in Alaskan waters. I express here the hope that part of those funds may be expended in the South where there is a vast potential source of shrimp. I have been told that enough shrimp may be found there to supply 25 percent of the U.S. domestic consumption which runs approximately 400 million pounds.

I extend my congratulations and thanks to the acting chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who cannot be with us today.

The committee has reported a splendid bill, a bill which ought to be passed without opposition.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alaska is a very important member of our subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. His service has been invaluable. Particularly, in the field of anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation. The Senator from Alaska conducted most of the hearings on these two items, both for the commercial and the sports fisheries.

The committee did allow the funds, as I said earlier, because there was a time limit on the expenditures of the \$25 million. We believed that a great need

was evidenced and were very happy to allow this item.

I hope that the entire amount can be held in conference.

Mr. President, on page 26, line 4 of the bill, the date of October 3, 1965, is a typographical error. It should be October 30, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that this change be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I rise to support strongly the recommendation of the Senate Appropriation Committee to provide an additional \$250,000 to provide additional staffing at the Southern Hardwoods Laboratory located at Stoneville, Miss.

Although this Laboratory happens to be located in my State, it is a facility which has great regional importance. Research at this Laboratory is designed to provide improved forestry management and use of 70 million acres of commercial hardwoods throughout the South. The benefits derived from this research extend far beyond the boundaries of my own State—indeed it affects approximately 60 percent of the national hardwood production.

The additional funds provided in this bill will enable the professional staff at the Laboratory to be brought up to the level originally anticipated when this Laboratory was designed and constructed. These additional staff personnel will enable the research to be greatly accelerated in the many problems affecting southern hardwoods.

An example of the need to accelerate this research is indicated by the fact that disease causes an estimated \$2 billion annual loss in southern hardwoods. Likewise, damage sustained from insects and wildlife is substantial. The small cost of accelerating research on these problems can be recovered manifold in just 1 year if substantial progress is made in eliminating some of these problems.

I repeat for emphasis, the scope of this Laboratory is regional and the work performed at the Laboratory affects the entire hardwood industry throughout the southern part of the United States. It is for these reasons that I strongly support this appropriation.

#### KENTUCKY TROUT HATCHERY FUNDS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am pleased to note at page 20 of the report that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended among the increases over the budget estimate and the House allowances funds in the amount of \$20,000 for the "determination of suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky."

I appeared on March 16 before the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department's budget and testified in support of the inclusion of these funds and also submitted a detailed statement on behalf of the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife. I note that this is the first time that any funds for a trout hatchery in Kentucky have ever been recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee. This action by the committee demonstrates clearly that it is the committee's decision that



the Department of the Interior proceed with the determination of a suitable site for a trout hatchery without further delay, and on behalf of the people of Kentucky, I am very happy that the committee reached this decision.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee in this connection be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN S. COOPER, A U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF KENTUCKY  
ESTABLISHMENT OF TROUT HATCHERY ON CUMBERLAND RIVER, KY.

Senator BARTLETT. Senator COOPER.  
Senator COOPER. Thank you Senator BARTLETT, and the committee.

I have two requests that I will make of the committee. One is to provide planning funds for the establishment of a trout hatchery on the Cumberland River in Kentucky, below Wolf Creek Dam which impounds Cumberland Reservoir. To give some background of the problem, let me say that the Governor of Kentucky, the commissioner of the department of fish and wildlife, the director of the division of fisheries, the membership of the League of Kentucky Sportsmen and the congressional delegation of Kentucky, have requested the Department of the Interior to proceed with planning for this hatchery, and I have also requested funds from this committee. Last year I came before you and, while the committee did not provide funds for planning at that time, Senator HAYDEN in a colloquy on the floor told me that he would give the utmost consideration to this request and he felt the committee would do so.

#### KENTUCKY PAST TROUT STOCKING

Since 1948 Kentucky has been stocking trout in its streams from hatcheries in other States, primarily from a hatchery in Virginia and one in Tennessee. The first stockings were experimental in nature, but in 1952, a trout fishery was established below Wolf Creek Dam on the Cumberland River at a point near where it is proposed that a hatchery now be constructed. It has been very successful and, from the history of this experimental work, certain conclusions can be drawn.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE STATEMENT AND SURVEY

The department of fish and wildlife in the Kentucky State government has provided a statement which I will file. Its survey shows that at least 75 streams in Kentucky can support a trout fishery of which some 515 miles of streams are suitable for stocking trout. There are 30,000 acres in reservoirs which would be suitable for trout stocking.

#### KENTUCKY NAVIGABLE STREAMS

I might say here that while it is not generally known—unless Alaska has now taken the lead—Kentucky has more miles of navigable streams than any State in the Union.

Senator BARTLETT. This is the first time I find myself unable to claim Alaska is first, because I do not know.

Senator COOPER. You might have more miles of streams than we have but I suppose our claim is we have more miles of navigable streams. We are fourth nationally in the number of rivers that we have in our State.

#### DEPARTMENT AND BUREAU OPPOSITION AND DEARTH OF HATCHERIES IN SOUTH

I do not think there is any question that the qualities that are needed for a fish hatchery have been established in Kentucky. But I might say that I think the Department of the Interior and its Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife has quibbled about this. However, they have said that during

the next 5 years Kentucky could use about 91,500 pounds of trout annually which meets the 5-year estimate of the State of Kentucky.

The Department has suggested that trout could be furnished from Tennessee or Virginia, as in the past. But, to supply trout from Virginia for some of the streams would involve haulage up to 600 miles, the nearest point being 250 miles. Tennessee is somewhat closer, but I think any examination would show that Tennessee can use all of the trout that its hatchery produces.

The Department has also said that it will have to determine if there is a suitable site available. Yet the facts show that the Corps of Engineers has assured the State that it would make a site available. I am conscious of the problems of the Department of the Interior and its Division of Wildlife but I want to call the subcommittee's attention to the fact that if you examine the list of present trout hatcheries, you would find there are very few in the South. I notice in the report of the committee for last year that funds were made available for studies and for continued appropriations to a number of hatcheries in the North. Of course that may be because their streams are generally more suitable. But when there are streams in a Southern State which can support trout, and are appropriate for it, then an effort should be made to develop the potential in that area.

For 5 or 6 years or perhaps longer our Kentucky congressional delegation has been meeting with representatives of the Department of the Interior on this subject. I am not one who wants to place blame, but I must say in this instance I think the Department has dragged its feet and that it has not made the investigations or completed the studies it should have made. Even now the Department's answers is that it wants to continue to make further studies of streams and related factors which data is already available.

#### FUNDS REQUEST

Based on this long record, I earnestly ask that the committee take this matter in hand and if it cannot supply the \$50,000 that the Department says it would need to make this study, then at least supply some funds—\$20,000 or \$25,000—so that the Department will actually make the study, report to this committee, and report to our State. It has not done it. And I ask that this be done.

Senator BARTLETT. \$50,000 seems quite a little for a study, don't you think?

Senator COOPER. I think so, but as I say in our report—

Senator BARTLETT. That is what they want.

Senator COOPER. Yes; and if that is too much, I would say give them \$25,000. Because of the data which have been accumulated by the State, and the data which they say they have accumulated themselves in the past years, I believe they can make this study and make a determination.

Senator BARTLETT. The committee will give it close consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the unanimous action of the Appropriations Committee in placing in the bill an unbudgeted item of \$500,000 for the acquisition of land to help round out the Everglades National Park. I think I should state in the RECORD the reasons behind our action in this matter.

For the last 6 fiscal years prior to this year the Bureau of the Budget has seen fit to include in the budget items for this purpose ranging all the way from \$450,000 some 6 years ago to \$1,125,000 last year.

On every occasion the Senate committee has inserted these items in the bill. On every occasion, in the face of rather

determined opposition in the conference, these items have been eliminated in conference.

I am informed that some of the earlier opposition in the House of Representatives to this particular item has diminished and that there is a good chance of the conferees approving the item. I asked the committee, therefore, to include only \$500,000, as opposed to the \$1,125,000 requested last year, which was placed in the Senate bill, and eliminated in conference.

The reasons for my placing this item before the committee, are these: The State of Florida long ago fulfilled its commitments in this regard. It decided to the Federal Government something like 850,000 acres of land and water for the purpose of setting up the Everglades National Park. If that land were to be valued at only \$10 an acre—and it is worth much more than that—that would be \$8.5 million.

The State of Florida later made a cash grant of \$2 million as its part toward the acquisition of inholdings. The Federal Government was expected to put up \$2 million as authorized by Public Law 85-482, July 2, 1958. Unfortunately, the Federal Government has never been able to go ahead with its part of its contribution. It was for that reason that I requested the committee, acting upon the request of the Bureau of the Budget, after 6 straight years, to put in less than half of the requested item this year.

The reasons for my doing so are well set forth in a letter written by me to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, under date of May 10, 1966, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1966.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,  
Chairman, Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Everglades National Park, Florida, was established by the Act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816; 16 U.S.C., secs. 410, 410a-410c).

Public Law 85-482, July 2, 1958, established boundaries of the park, authorized the transfer of certain lands between the Federal Government and the State of Florida and authorized to be appropriated \$2 million for acquisition of privately owned lands within the park.

Under Public Law 85-482 the Secretary of the Interior transferred to the State of Florida about 65,000 acres of federal land lying outside the revised boundaries in exchange for about 64,000 acres of State lands within the revised boundaries. These exchanges of lands were completed on February 25, 1959. In addition, some 1,290,091 acres of land have been donated by the State, local agencies and private donors some of which are acquired by a \$2 million cash grant made by the State of Florida.

Since 1961 efforts have been made through budget requests for the necessary funds to purchase privately owned lands within the park boundaries (Hole in Donut), and other inholdings.

In fiscal year 1961 and fiscal year 1962 the budgets as submitted to the Congress contained \$450,000 for this acquisition. The House denied the requests and the Senate, on



both occasions, restored the monies only to lose them in Conference.

In fiscal year 1963 and fiscal year 1964 the budgets submitted to the Congress contained \$500,000 for the acquisition. The House again denied the requests and the Senate again restored the funds only to again lose them in Conference.

In fiscal year 1965 there was no budget request for the regular appropriation. However, \$452,000 was in the Supplemental bill to purchase the Iori property which contained some 4,420 acres within the park boundaries. This property was obtained by the Department of Agriculture through foreclosure of certain liens which the Department held through the Farmers Home Administration. The property was simply transferred from one Federal agency to another.

In fiscal year 1966 a budget request for \$1,125,500 was submitted to the Congress, which included \$125,500 for the acquisition of the Smallwood area, in which is located Indian mounds (shells) and an Indian camp, as well as funds for the Hole in Donut. None of these funds were appropriated though the Senate itself approved the request but later it was lost in Conference.

To date the only funds appropriated under the authority of Public Law 85-482 enacted in 1958 has been the \$452,000 previously mentioned.

The State of Florida has evidenced good faith and performed its full obligation in the transfer of some 850,000 acres of land to the park and by expending some \$2 million for the acquisition of some of the private lands transferred to the park. Therefore, it is only right that the Federal Government show good faith by the acquisition of the Hole in Donut and other inholdings in order that the park boundaries may be rounded out. It is past time that the commitment of \$2 million for this purpose made by the Congress in 1958 be carried out.

I earnestly request favorable consideration of the inclusion of \$500,000 in the Department of the Interior Appropriation bill to enable a long sought after effort—since 1960—to start acquisition of the lands in the park which are privately owned, to which acquisition the Federal Government is fully committed.

With kind regards, I remain,

Yours faithfully,

SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while I think the matter is well set forth in this letter, I want this additional statement to appear in the RECORD at this point.

I have for several years been negotiating with a private foundation in an effort to secure its help in rounding out this park by acquiring sites of interest, as, for example, one which includes a rather sizable area of Indian mounds. Those mounds have been undisturbed. They are there as they have been for centuries.

I have run into the question repeatedly, "How can you ask us to provide this when the Federal Government is not doing its part?"

I think we are at the stage where if we can get the Federal Government to perform its part of the obligation, which it entered into many years ago, we can get substantial help from these particular private foundations, and in connection with the particular proposal which I have mentioned, I know others are interested in the park, who have negotiated with other private foundations, with the same result.

Is it not natural for people handling large sums of private funds which are available for such purposes to say, "We must see an interest in the Federal Government in carrying out its obligation before we can be active in this regard, in which we are interested"?

I have, therefore, set forth the reasons for the inclusion of the item of \$500,000 for land acquisition for the Everglades National Park. I appreciate it very much the action of the Appropriations Committee to that end, and the fact that the Senate is about to act on this matter without objection to this particular item.

I hope sincerely the conferees from the other body will be able to agree on this matter, and decide to approve the item, and thus show the interest of the Federal Government in fulfilling its obligation in this important matter.

BEREA, KY., FOREST RESEARCH CENTER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President. The Senator from Nevada, who is handling the bill, may recall that I appeared before the Appropriations Committee requesting funds for planning the forest research building to be constructed at the Berea, Ky., Forest Research Center. My statement supporting this request appears on pages 1848 to 1854 of the hearings, together with letters from the Commissioner of Natural Resources, Mr. Matlick, and from President Hutchins.

Last year, the Senate included funds for this purpose, but they were not allowed by the House. For that reason, I came before the committee again this year to call attention to the needs to house strip mine restoration and other research which is going forward there. The House has now allowed funds in the amount of \$40,000 for this purpose, and I am very glad that the Senate committee has also recommended that amount. If the Senate agrees to the committee recommendation, as I am sure it will, funds for planning the building at Berea will be assured.

The forest research and strip mine restoration work proceeding at the Berea Center, as it has been developed in recent years, is a credit to the leadership, initiative and perseverance of Mr. R. D. Lane. I ask unanimous consent that a letter by the Commissioner of Natural Resources of the State of Kentucky, Mr. J. O. Matlick, on his advancement to be director of the Northeastern Experiment Station with continued responsibility for the forest research program in Kentucky, be inserted in the RECORD.

I support the \$9 million recommended by the Senate Committee for the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, which I supported last year.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 30, 1966.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: A few days ago, Mr. Edward P. Cliff, Chief, U.S. Forest Service wrote to me about the reorganization of the Forest Service in eastern United States. I was greatly pleased and gratified to learn from Mr. Cliff that Mr. R. D. Lane, formerly Director of the Central States Forest Experi-

ment Station, is now Director at the Northeastern Experiment Station and will continue to have responsibility for the Forest Service research program in Kentucky.

Under Mr. Lane's very capable and imaginative leadership, we have made in Kentucky fine progress toward a forestry research program of state and national significance. Forest Service scientists located at Berea, Kentucky, have aggressively tackled several difficult and complex research problems of major importance to us. They have undertaken their work quietly, efficiently, and without fanfare. And they have sought our advice and counsel in selection of research problems, have coordinated their work with our programs, and have consistently given us full assistance whenever we have called upon them. Moreover, with Mr. Lane's guidance, they have cooperated with and assisted others, such as the University of Kentucky, in developing a coordinated, productive forestry research program for Kentucky.

Let me give you a few examples of the excellent contributions they have made:

1. With their assistance we have established a Wood Use Demonstration and Training Center that promises to assist materially in expanding wood-based industries as well as employment opportunities in the highlands of eastern Kentucky and thus strengthen the economy of this area. The facility is operated by the University of Kentucky and located at Quicksand.

2. My Department and the Forest Service joined forces to make a thorough inventory of our state's forests. This work, now completed, gives us the most intensive, detailed inventory ever made of our state's forest resources. We have had a flood of inquiries about timber supplies in Kentucky and I am confident that our inventory will lead to the establishment of several new wood-based industries in our state.

3. Our State Legislature just recently passed a most stringent surface mine restoration law. The research conducted by Forest Service scientists at Berea provided the basis for this new law and for regulations being developed under it. Research programs they have in progress, although quite small in relation to the total problems, will help both us and the Kentucky mining industry abide by the new laws as well as other States and the industry throughout the Appalachian coal field.

We hold in great esteem the Forest Service scientists at Berea, Kentucky, and their director, Mr. Lane. They are, in our opinion, a distinct credit to your Department and to the Forest Service.

J. O. MATLICK.

Mr. PELL: Mr. President, I should like to take note of the fact that the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior and related agencies, which we are considering today, contains a provision of \$9 million for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. This is a matter of special interest to me since I am chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities which last year handled the authorizing legislation for this program.

I am pleased to note that although the Senate bill still represents a cut of \$4.9 or more than a third less than the budget request, it does provide \$2 million more than the House bill allowed, with all of the increase going to the National Endowment for the Humanities. This is entirely appropriate since the House committee passed over the request for the humanities endowment without prejudice, in view of the fact that the endowment's program had not been



fully formulated at the time the House committee considered the bill.

However, it seems to me the record should show that the Senate bill still reflects some very substantial cuts in the basic programs envisioned under the new National Foundation. The largest is a cut of \$3 million in the amount requested for the Endowment on the Humanities. In addition, the basic grant program under the Arts Endowment has been cut \$1 million; the State grant-in-aid program has been cut \$750,000 and the administrative allowance has been cut \$180,000.

It is unfortunate indeed that these worthy programs must be held back because of the budgetary constrictions resulting from the situation in Vietnam. While none of us would assert a civilian priority under these conditions, it does seem to me that our cultural well-being as a Nation should hold a high claim under normal circumstances, and one which has long remained neglected. I therefore hope that the amounts cut from the projected programs of the foundation will be restored as soon as possible, hopefully in supplemental appropriations next year.

In the meantime, I hope that the foundation will be able to manage resourcefully with the funds allotted to it, and that, in particular it will be able to make equitable distributions to the States on the basis of need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 14215) was passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the presiding officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada for another outstanding contribution as the floor manager of this important measure. It is rather routine to achieve success on measures supported by the articulate and able advocacy of the senior Nevada Senator, but it is unusual indeed in this Chamber to pass a bill of this dimension affecting so many

interests and so many parts of the country, with the ease and expedition witnessed today. Such an achievement can be obtained only with the greatest of skill and ability.

I commend the senior Senator from Nevada and thank him on behalf of the country as a whole and particularly on behalf of the people of Montana.

Of course, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee as well as the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and others are to be commended for their support. But, as always, a success of this magnitude is a tribute to the entire Senate.

#### RESERVOIR ADMISSION FEES CONTRARY TO EARLIER PROMISE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the last few years we have grown used to what is called the credibility gap with regard to foreign affairs and defense matters in the Johnson-Humphrey regime. Now I'm afraid we are experiencing a complete lack of credibility when dealing with the domestic policies of this administration.

A situation has again developed which leads me to question the credibility of this administration. Before I go into that, however, I believe I should lay a little groundwork. Through my home State the mighty Missouri River flows. We have been able to tame, to a certain extent, the violent wanderings of this river when the spring thaw and the March and April rains used to produce enough moisture to force the river over its banks.

We did this through the Missouri River development program. In 1944 Congress passed legislation popularly called the Pick-Sloan plan. The purpose of this plan was fourfold: flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri.

These four purposes still remain as the main reasons for the existence of the dams and the reservoirs that channel that river. Certain other benefits have derived from these dams but they are secondary in nature and always will be. Among these secondary benefits are scenic beauty and recreation.

I mention this because recently the Corps of Engineers announced certain areas that would be included as "designated areas" for the year April 1, 1966, to March 31, 1967, at which admission fees would be charged. This requirement for designated areas flows from a series of legislation, executive orders, and administrative regulations that began with the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

In this piece of legislation, the Congress, by amending some existing laws and initiating others, determined that it should be the will of the legislative branch that certain areas be open to assessment of admission and user fees. As I will substantiate later, the legislative history also makes it clear that certain other areas were not included in this program.

A key point in this legislation was the limitations and requirements written into the bill as to what areas could be considered applicable for the admission fee program. These requirements which must be concurrent were:

First. Areas at which either recreation user or entrance fees may be charged must be designated by the President and all such areas must be posted.

Second. Entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

Third. The particular area for which entrance or admission fees can be charged must be administered by a Federal agency.

Fourth. The recreational facilities or services where such fees are charged must be provided at Federal expense.

In regard to this criteria, I would like to stress two things. First of all, they must be concurrent. Second, there is a requirement that the primary purpose be for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife reasons.

Following the enactment of this legislation into law, Public Law 88-578, the President, on March 2, 1965, issued Executive Order No. 11200, designed to implement the provisions of that law. It specifically set out the criteria to be followed in determining the designated areas for 1965. The criteria listed were, properly enough, the same criteria enumerated in the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. The Executive order also required all subordinate units of the executive branch, including the Department of the Interior, to annually review all areas under their respective jurisdictions to determine whether any additional areas should, in accordance with the designated criteria, be designated as areas for which entrance, admission, or other recreation user fees were to be collected in future years.

On January 30 of this year, Secretary of the Interior Udall announced the sale of a new permit called the Federal Recreation Area Entrance Permit. At the same time he issued regulations spelling out the Federal Recreation Area Entrance Permit charges authorized by the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. These regulations, as listed in the Federal Register of December 31, 1965, make no mention of any criteria for determining designated areas other than the fact that authority for these fees was derived from the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 and Executive Order No. 11200. In the news release that accompanied this announcement, however, the criteria originally listed in Public Law 88-587 were described as conditions which must be met in order for fees to be charged.

Mr. President, I have set out this history behind these designated areas because I wanted to show that the authority for them started with the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965. To my knowledge, this legislation still controls.

It was with a great deal of surprise, then, that I learned that the Corps of



Engineers had listed four reservoirs on the Missouri River in South Dakota as designated areas. These four reservoirs are Big Bend, Fort Randall, Lewis and Clark Lake, at Gavins Point, and Oahe.

I was surprised because I had previously been informed by Edward Crafts, Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of Interior and the man who oversees this admission fee program, that these Missouri River Reservoirs would not qualify for admission charges under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965.

In anticipation of the exact same problem we are confronted with today, in 1964 prior to the passage of Public Law 88-578, I attempted to elicit from Mr. Crafts an answer to whether or not passage of that bill would affect the Missouri River Reservoirs. At two different times he assured me that it would not.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter which I received from Mr. Crafts, answering in detail questions along this line, which I directed to him in a letter dated February 13, 1964, and also a colloquy between Mr. Crafts and myself when he appeared before the subcommittee on appropriations for the Interior Department.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,  
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1964.

HON. KARL E. MUNDT,  
U.S. Senate  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUNDT: We have received your letter of February 13, with further reference to the proposed land and water conservation fund.

At times, after acts of Congress have been passed, unforeseen questions have subsequently arisen, in connection with the administration of their provisions, as to the intention of the Congress with respect to a given situation. Fortunately, the interest of the Congress in the proposed land and water conservation fund is so great that a record is being made that should reduce this type of problem to the minimum.

Your recital of the provision in S. 859, as modified by the House Interior Committee in reporting H.R. 3846, is entirely correct. Concerning the question you raise—its probable effect regarding charges for recreation use of Missouri River reservoirs in South Dakota—it is necessary to consider the following limitations and requirements that have been incorporated in the bill:

1. Areas at which either recreation user or entrance fees, may be charged must be designated by the President, and all such areas must be posted.

2. Entrance and admission fees may be charged only where a Federal area is administered primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, recreational, or wildlife purposes.

3. The particular area for which entrance or admission fees can be charged must be administered by a Federal agency.

4. The recreational facilities or services where such fees are charged must be provided at Federal expense.

These requirements, you will perceive, which presumably will remain in the bill, clearly limit the areas for which charges can be made as a source of revenue for the land and water conservation fund.

Moreover, it is clear also from these pro-

visions of the bill as reported to the House that no Federal admission or entrance fee could be charged at Federal areas that are leased to a State or to other public or private agency for exclusive operation of the recreation resource, such as is the practice at many Federal water development projects.

The first question that arises, of course, is whether or not these particular reservoirs are administered "primarily" for recreational or other purposes, as enumerated in item 1 above. We believe this is not the case from our present knowledge of these reservoirs. The following quotation is taken from page 7 of a publication by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, entitled "Water Resources Development in South Dakota, 1963":

"COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

"The 1944 Flood Control Act approved the expansion of the general comprehensive plan for the control of floods and development of water resources in the Missouri River Basin. The basinwide plan, popularly known as the Pick-Sloan plan, was based upon two proposals, the first recommended by the Corps of Engineers in the summer of 1943, and the second by the Bureau of Reclamation in the spring of 1944. It is a multiple-purpose program designed primarily for four basic purposes: flood control, irrigation, production of hydroelectric power, and improvement of navigation on the lower Missouri. Other allied benefits to the people of the valley and to the Nation are improved municipal water supply and sanitation, soil erosion control, conservation of fish and wildlife, and public recreational advantages."

Accordingly, I am convinced that the Missouri River Reservoirs constructed by the Corps of Engineers in South Dakota are not in fact administered primarily for recreation or other purposes that would qualify them for the making of entrance or admission charges to these areas as a whole.

As in the case of the national forests, there may be small developed areas on the Federal land bordering a reservoir where the Federal Government makes substantial expenditures for recreation purposes and for which it would be reasonable and logical to make nominal charges. This, of course, would not restrict general public use of the water area of the reservoirs without charge.

In connection with the foregoing, we note that the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in House Report No. 900, on page 20, is very clear on this point: "The bill will not be applicable to areas where recreation is purely incidental to another major purpose of the area, to areas where neither Federal personnel nor Federal facilities are provided for the recreationist, or to areas which are turned over by a Federal agency to a local authority for administration."

I hope this will help to clarify some of the questions in your mind. As your secretary may have told you, I have called to ask for an appointment to see you, at which time I would like to discuss the fund bill, some of the other recent correspondence which you have sent to me, as well as certain activities of the Bureau which may be of particular interest to your State.

I appreciate very much your interest.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD C. CRAFTS, Director.

#### COLLOQUY BETWEEN MR. CRAFTS AND SENATOR MUNDT

MR. MUNDT. I want to ask you a couple of questions about that. What would you envision as the kind of establishment on the chain of Missouri River reservoirs out in the Midwest in connection with this program of charging user fees as admission, under the act? I have had a lot of questions about that, and I have had no answers to give.

#### HOUSE MODIFIED BILL

MR. CRAFTS. Senator MUNDT, under the terms of the bill, as reported by the House

committee—and this, I think, is the draft of the bill that I should speak to, because the House committee substantially modified the bill from the way it was originally set up—under the terms of the bill as reported by the committee, the admission fees or entrance fees can be assessed only if certain conditions prevail.

#### FEE ASSESSMENT

I think they need to be listed and there are four of them.

Areas that are federally administered directly, not under lease to the State or private concessionaires. They need to be areas that are administered primarily for recreation. And this is a very key point, the word "primary." They need to be areas of which Federal facilities are provided at Federal expense, and the areas need to be posted.

Now, most of the reservoirs in the Missouri River, and I am speaking in general here—I think the same would apply to reservoirs on most of the rivers—are built either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers.

Senator MUNDT. May I interrupt. The Missouri River chain of projects were authorized under special legislation. Criteria that apply there might not apply to others, so maybe we had better stick to the Missouri River.

MR. CRAFTS. As far as I know, with respect to the Missouri River, the purpose of the reservoirs was primarily not recreation.

Senator MUNDT. That is correct.

#### EXCLUSION OF FEES

MR. CRAFTS. Therefore, we have gone on record in this in response to similar questions from other Members of Congress that on the reservoirs which are not administered primarily for recreation, it would not be possible, under the terms of the House bill, to impose a general admission or entrance fee.

It would be possible to charge a specific user fee for launching facilities, for camping facilities, for this sort of thing, but not a general entrance or admission fee.

MR. MUNDT. I think it is clear, on the basis of Mr. Crafts' letter and his answers to my questions in committee that the Missouri River Reservoirs were never intended to be included in the designated areas for admission charges. I think it is also clear that the floor debate on this legislation, which can be found on pages 19115 through 19117 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 12, 1964, points in this direction. At that time I made the same argument that is being made today; namely, that because the purpose of these reservoirs is not primarily for recreation, the reservoirs do not meet the requirements set forth for the levying of charges under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This argument was not refuted on the floor by the managers of the bill. Therefore, legislative history of the act clearly supports my contention that these reserves should be exempt from the recently imposed visitors' fees.

MR. President, the reason we hold congressional hearings and the reason we participate in floor debate is to attempt to obtain answers to questions about specific provisions in pending legislation. This is the way legislative history is established. Once we obtain these answers and rely upon them in making our final determination on the legislation we should be secure in the knowledge that these answers will remain the same after laws have been enacted.







# **DIGEST** of Congressional Proceedings

## OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 17, 1966  
For actions of May 16, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 80

### CONTENTS

Animal research.....18	Farm program.....19	Personnel.....35,43
Appropriations.....2,37,38	Food for India.....41	Public Law 480.....16
Atomic energy.....39	Foreign trade.....16,29	Reclamation.....9
Awards.....14	Forest Service.....2	Recreation.....8,33
Balance of payments.....23	Labeling.....15,30	Research.....18,25
Banking.....6	Labor standards....7,13,17	Soil Stewardship Week.3,21
Cattle hides.....42	Legislative program....13	Statute of limitation...12
Child nutrition.....20	Loan pools.....1,13,22,28	Supplemental
Claims.....12	Marketing.....15,32	appropriations.....37
Congressional ethics....24	Milk program.....20	Trails.....36
Conservation.....3,21	Minimum wage.....7,13,17	Transportation.....27
Copper imports.....5	National park.....34	Vegetables.....32
Cosponsors.....18	Opinion poll.....26	Veterans' loans.....4
Cotton.....40	Packaging.....15,30	Water resources.....18
Exposition.....10	Participation sales	Weather control.....11
Farm labor.....31	.....1,13,22,28	

**HIGHLIGHTS:** House debated participation sales bill. Senate committee voted to report fair packaging and labeling bill.

### HOUSE

1. **PARTICIPATION SALES.** Began debate on H. R. 14544, to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide a method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies. The rule providing for consideration of this bill was agreed to by a vote of 184 to 127. pp. 10062-87
2. **INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL.** House conferees were appointed on this bill, H. R. 14215, which includes Forest Service items. Senate conferees had been appointed. p. 10031



3. SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK. Sen. Albert commended this project and inserted the President's proclamation. p. 10032
  4. VETERANS' LOANS. Passed as reported H. R. 7850, to extend the provisions for treble-damage actions to veterans' direct and insured loan cases. pp. 10034-5
  5. COPPER IMPORTS. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 12676, to suspend duty on certain copper imports for the period Feb. 9, 1966, through June 30, 1968. pp. 10044-7
  6. BANKING. Rep. Patman claimed Federal bank supervision causes high interest rates and unfair competition for thrift institutions. pp. 10088-9
  7. LABOR STANDARDS. Del. Polanco-Abreu claimed the minimum wage bill is geared toward the mainland situation and that its agricultural and other provisions would harm Puerto Rico. pp. 10089-95
  8. RECREATION. The Public Works Committee reported (May 13 during adjournment) with amendment H. R. 13313, to prohibit certain user fees on Corps of Engineers projects (H. Rept. 1531) (p. 10114). Rep. Cleveland inserted the Interior Department's report opposing this bill (p. 10099-100).
  9. RECLAMATION. Rep. Tunney commended the "Imperial Valley success story." pp. 10105-6
- Both Houses
10. EXPOSITION. /received from the President the recommendations of the Commerce Department regarding Federal participation in the HemisFair 1968 Exposition to be held at San Antonio, Tex. p. 10114, 10133
  11. WEATHER CONTROL. Received from the President the report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology, "National Atmospheric Sciences Program." p. 1011
  12. CLAIMS. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments H. R. 13650, to authorize increased agency consideration of tort claims against the Government (H. Rept. 1532); H. R. 13651, to avoid unnecessary litigation by providing for collection of U. S. claims (H. Rept. 1533); H. R. 13652, to provide a statute of limitations for certain actions brought by the Government (H. Rept. 1534); and H. R. 14182, to provide for judgments for costs against the U. S. (H. Rept. 1535). p. 10114
  13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The House is scheduled to consider the Private Calendar today, to be followed by the participation sales bill and the minimum wage bill. p. D420

SENATE

14. AWARDS. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendments S. 2463, to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments (S. Rept. 1160). p. 10136
15. MARKETING. The Commerce Committee, on May 13, during adjournment, voted to report "in the nature of a substitute bill" S. 985, the proposed Fair Packaging and Labeling Act. p. D418



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 16, 1966

No. 80

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. John W. Pressly, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Sacramento, Calif., offered the following prayer:

God of our lives, Thou who art our highest thought and our noblest aspiration, we ask that Thou will free us from a stubborn trust in ourselves. Enable us to trust in Thy guiding providence. May the mists of doubt be dispelled in the light of a vigorous and confident faith.

Here today in this distinguished Chamber of national deliberation, where history has been made, where tradition bespeaks integrity, freedom, and justice for all men, help these Representatives of the people that they may not merely represent their constituents, important as this is in our system of government, but that they may truly seek the welfare and security of all and be true to their own ideals, integrity, and faith in Thee.

Bless each legislator in his unselfish commitment and grant to each one so committed the full measure of personal satisfaction in their individual and public life. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 12, 1966, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 14215. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 14215) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL of Georgia, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr.

BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 108. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for membership of the United States in the Pan American Institute of Geography and History and to authorize appropriations therefor.

### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington D.C., May 11, 1966.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the duty to inform you that I have transmitted to the Honorable George Romney, Governor of Michigan, my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Ninth District of Michigan, effective at the close of business, May 10, 1966.

I leave the House of Representatives to assume the office of U.S. Senator from Michigan.

With kind personal regards, I am  
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington D.C., May 11, 1966.

Hon. GEORGE ROMNEY,  
Governor of Michigan,  
Lansing, Mich.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROMNEY: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Ninth District of Michigan, effective at the close of business, May 10, 1966.

With kind personal regards, I am  
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.

### DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. DENTON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Messrs. MARSH, MAHON, REIFEL, McDADE, and Bow.

### KY STATEMENT FRAUGHT WITH INHERENT DANGERS

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, last week I warned of the dangers in the leadership of South Vietnam by Premier Ky. I was alarmed by statements which cast doubt about whether free elections in that country could ever be held while Ky remains in power.

Yesterday my fears were realized as Ky took over Da Nang by force.

Through tactics similar to those employed by the Vietcong, Ky accomplished by force that which he was unable to accomplish by the democratic process.

The people of South Vietnam rely upon the United States to guarantee their freedom from attacks from both within and without. Premier Ky has abused our protective assistance and is indeed coming to exemplify that which we are fighting against in Vietnam—a dictatorship of force.

With Ky's seizure of Da Nang, an overt act of violence, how can we hope for free elections?

I have supported Ky's government in the past, not the man nor his intemperate acts, but a caretaker government which I hoped would provide some stability during the emergency brought about by Communist aggression. But Ky's action endangers the faith of the entire free



world in the rightness of our cause in Vietnam.

I call upon the ruling junta in Saigon to remove Premier Ky from power.

The United States is paying an increasingly steep price in the lives of our young men that the South Vietnamese people might have a chance to live in freedom.

It is intolerable that our Government continues to support a man who more and more is coming to represent what we are fighting against—rule by force in defiance of the will of the people.

#### THE MINIMUM WAGE BILL

(Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a proposed amendment to the minimum wage bill.)

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow and Wednesday the House will be considering H.R. 13712, the bill to raise the minimum wage. I support this bill and intend to vote in favor of it. I urge all my colleagues to do the same.

I am concerned, however, not with the level at which the minimum will be set, but with the speed with which we proceed to that level. I think we would do the cause of full employment and decent living standards a great disservice if we move to the \$1.60 level too rapidly. I intend, therefore, to offer an amendment which will bring the \$1.60 minimum wage into effect at a more reasonable time.

For the information of the House, I insert in the RECORD at this point the text of my amendment. I intend to make a more complete statement later when the debate actually begins:

#### AMENDMENT TO H.R. 13712, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. MORRIS

Page 46, beginning in line 24, strike out "during the first year" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "during the first three years".

#### SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include a letter.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, during the period of May 15 to 22 local churches throughout the United States are observing Soil Stewardship Week. This annual observance is sponsored by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts and the 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts which blanket the Nation.

The subject of this year's observance is "Crisis in the Countryside." Ministers of all faiths are carrying vital messages to their followers to further God's purpose.

I salute the thousands of clergy of all faiths who use this observance to remind us that soil stewardship is everyone's responsibility. It is a responsibility of people who live in the towns and cities as well as those who work the land.

The President of the United States has recognized Soil Stewardship Week with a special statement issued from the White House. President Johnson stated:

It is our responsibility to make certain that our stewardship of the soil ensures progress and prosperity for the generations of the future.

Under unanimous consent, I insert into the RECORD the full text of President Johnson's statement:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, May 2, 1966.

It is appropriate that we set aside a Soil Stewardship Week each year to rededicate our commitment to the preservation of our precious natural heritage.

This observance reminds all responsible Americans of our duty to protect our threatened land and water resources, to restore those which have been ill-used, and to develop their rich potential for the benefit of all of our people.

Much of the future of the country lies in the wise and proper use of its rural lands. It is our responsibility to make certain that our stewardship of the soil ensures progress and prosperity for the generations of the future.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

#### TIME FOR LESS EMOTIONAL LOOK AT AUTO SAFETY

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the stock market closed last week in a tailspin and amid reports of a decline in automobile sales and production widely attributed to the impact upon the public of the congressional investigation of car safety.

This disturbing chain of events, underscoring again the bellwether position of the automobile industry in our economy, while not a cause for panic, is certainly a cause for concern. At a time when the economy is experiencing high employment and prosperity, it is incredible that right here under the Capitol dome we can talk ourselves into a decline such as this merely by the sensational play given a few people who have been acting like safety had just been discovered.

While I feel very strongly that every purchaser should have a safe automobile, I do not believe that even the most vehement critic intended that concern over safety should trigger a setback throughout the entire economy. But whatever the intentions, it is obviously time that we start to look at the problem a lot less emotionally and a lot more realistically.

The problem of safety on our highways is hardly a new one. People have been working on it for years. If anyone doubts this they should talk with the automobile workers themselves to see just how much safety is stressed within the plants. I know from personal experience the pride that our craftsmen take in what they are making.

Certainly cars can have more safety features, but it is a fact, recognized by the tests given for operators' licenses, that it is the driver's attitude that is the first cause of the overwhelming majority of accidents. It matters little what part of the automobile the driver or his victim comes into contact with as far as the real cause of the accident is concerned.

It is a cruel deception to lead the American people to believe that Congress can guarantee auto safety simply by legislating.

Before we go about trying to write any such Federal legislation, especially in an election year, I believe, we should heed the suggestion of Governor Romney, of Michigan, and first take a long hard look to see what could be realistically achieved through the existing State and local agencies which have the experience and facilities to get closer to this problem.

#### CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

#### AUTHORIZING ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS TO CONTRACT WITH MEDICAL SCHOOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 197) to amend chapter 73 of title 38 of the United States Code to authorize the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration to enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics for scarce technical services.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 197

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:*

"§ 4116. Contracts for scarce technical services.

"The Chief Medical Director may enter into contracts with medical schools and clinics to provide scarce technical services at Veterans' Administration facilities (including, but not limited to, services of radiologists, pathologists, and psychiatrists)."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 73 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"4116. Contracts for scarce technical services."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "§ 4116." and insert in lieu thereof "§ 4117."

On page 1, line 7, strike out "Chief Medical Director" and insert "Administrator" and strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 1, line 9, strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 2, after line 4, strike out "4116" and insert in lieu thereof "4117" and strike out "technical" and insert "medical specialist".

On page 2, beginning on line 5 insert the following:

"SEC. 2. That section 610 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) While any veteran is receiving hospital care in any Veterans' Administration facility, the Administrator may, within the limits of Veterans' Administration facilities, furnish medical services to correct or treat any nonservice-connected disability of such veteran, in addition to treatment incident to the disability for which he is hospitalized, if the veteran is willing, and the Administrator determines that the furnishing of such medical services (1) would be in the interest of the veteran, (2) would not prolong the hos-







# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 18, 1966  
For actions of May 17, 1966  
89th 2nd; No. 81

## CONTENTS

Adjournment.....25	Food.....6,16	Participation sales...2,11
Appropriations.....1,11,41	Foreign aid.....19	Personnel.....10
Awards.....14	Foreign trade.....16,27,39	Population.....6
Child nutrition.....32	Forest Service.....1,11	Poverty.....38
Commodity reserves.....16	Freight cars.....12	Purchasing.....29
Conservation.....17,28	Inflation.....22	Roads.....9
Cosponsors.....16	Information.....20	School milk.....21
Credit.....34	Intergovernmental relations.....24	Transportation.....12
Dairy imports.....16,30	Labor standards.....4,11	Visitor center.....15
Disaster relief.....3	Legislative program.....11	Water pollution.....36
Education.....8,18	Loan pools.....2,11	Water resources.....37
Exposition.....7	Opinion poll.....26	Weather.....23
Farm prices.....5,16	Packaging.....35	Wildlife.....40
Fish protein.....33	Parity prices.....16,31	
Fisheries.....13		

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on Interior appropriation bill, including Forest Service. House debated participation sales bill. Rep. Ashbrook criticized administration on farm prices issue. Rep. Gilligan introduced and recommended child nutrition bill. Reps. Rice and Stalbaum introduced and Rep. Race discussed dairy import bill.

## HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Received the conference report on H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill (H. Rept. 1538) (pp. 10314-6). The conference provided \$18,093,000 as proposed by the Senate for the Forest Service under the Land and Water Conservation Fund. A table reflecting the action of the conference is attached to this Digest.

2. PARTICIPATION SALES. Continued debate on H. R. 14544, the participation sales bill. pp. 10322-45



3. DISASTER RELIEF. Received from the President a report on activity under Public Law 875, 81st Cong., on disaster relief. pp. 10319, 10223
4. LABOR STANDARDS. Del. Polanco-Abreu protested the treatment of Puerto Rico in the labor standards bill. pp. 10347-55
5. FARM PRICES. Rep. Ashbrook criticized the record of the Administration on farm prices and inserted the recent Republican telegram to Secretary Freeman and the Secretary's reply. pp. 10361-3
6. POPULATION; FOOD NEEDS. Rep. Todd inserted an article, "FAO Finds Population Outpaces Food Gains." p. 10368
7. EXPOSITION. Received from the Commerce Department a report on the proposed U. S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. p. 10372
8. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported with amendment H. R. 14643, to provide for strengthening educational resources for international studies and research (H. Rept. 1539). p. 10372
9. ROADS. The Roads Subcommittee approved for full committee action a substitute for H. R. 14359, to authorize road appropriations for 1968 and 1969. p. D426
10. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill "to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended," which provides various restrictions on promotions and transfers; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 10372
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM as announced by Majority Leader Albert: Today, Interior appropriation bill and participation sales bill; next week, labor standards bill. p. 10345

SENATE

12. TRANSPORTATION. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 1098, to amend the Interstate Commerce Act so as to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10250-52
13. FISHERIES. The Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report S. J. Res. 29, to direct the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to survey the marine and fresh-water commercial fishery resources of the U. S., its territories and possessions. p. D424
14. AWARDS. Passed as reported S. 2463, to grant the consent of the Congress to the acceptance of certain gifts and decorations from foreign governments. pp. 10312-3
15. VISITOR CENTER. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. 3031, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a National Visitor Center (S. Rept. 1161). The bill was then referred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 10224

40. WILDLIFE. S. 3365 by Sen. Magnuson, to extend the period during which the funds may be appropriated pursuant to the act of October 4, 1961 (75 Stat. 813), for the conservation of migratory waterfowl; to Commerce Committee. Remarks of author pp. 10233-4
41. APPROPRIATIONS. S. 3372 by Sen. Metcalf, "to amend Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1966," to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

0

COMMITTEE HEARINGS MAY 18:

- S. Agriculture (exec).  
War on hunger, H. Agriculture (exec).  
Watershed protection in Carson Forest, S. Interior. (Greeley, FS, to testify).  
Road authorizations, including forest roads, S. Public Works (Cliff, FS, to testify).  
Pay bill, S. Civil Service (exec).  
Foreign aid authorizations, S. Foreign Relations (exec. to mark up).

oOo

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
Forest Service

	Available, 1966	Budget Estimates, 1967	House Bill, 1967	Senate Bill, 1967	Conference Report, 1967
ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS:					
Forest protection and utilization:					
Forest land management <u>a/</u> .....	<u>b/</u> \$164,152,000	\$172,856,000	\$172,821,000	\$174,521,000	\$173,850,000
Forest research .....	37,372,000	34,435,000	34,955,000	38,578,000	37,821,000
State and private forestry cooperation .....	17,558,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000
Total, Forest protection and utilization .....	219,082,000	225,188,000	225,673,000	230,996,000	229,568,000
Forest roads and trails .....	102,136,000	102,530,000	101,230,000	101,230,000	101,230,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests:					
Special acts .....	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Uinta National Forest .....	-	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Cooperative range improvements .....	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Assistance to States for tree planting	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Timber development organization loans and technical assistance .....	-	500,000	-	-	-
Total, Annual appropriations .....	322,998,000	330,298,000	328,983,000	334,306,000	332,878,000
PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS (Primarily "Payments to States and Territories" and "Roads and Trails for States" payable from national forest receipts) <u>c/</u> .....					
	57,268,000	60,950,000	60,950,000	60,950,000	60,950,000

a/ Includes contingency funds to the extent necessary as follows: (1) \$5,000,000 for emergency fire fighting and (2) \$1,910,000 for insect and disease control.

b/ Excludes proposed supplemental appropriation of \$7,500,000 for fighting forest fires.

c/ In addition, prior year balances available.



DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967

---

MAY 17, 1966.—Ordered to be printed

---

Mr. DENTON, from the committee of conference, submitted the  
following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 14215]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 24, 26, 39, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 27, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$48,855,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,032,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$114,690,300; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$56,118,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$80,032,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$12,950,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$34,740,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$20,701,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

*ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION*

*For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$38,145,800; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,118,600; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agreed to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

*ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION*

*For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000.*

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$35,932,800; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$4,998,900; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$173,850,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$37,821,000; and the Senate agree to the same.



Amendment numbered 32:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$13,464,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 5.

WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN REIFEL,  
JOSEPH M. McDADDE,  
FRANK T. BOW,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CARL HAYDEN,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
KARL E. MUNDT,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

## STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

### TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

#### PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

##### BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$48,855,000 for management of lands and resources instead of \$48,755,000 as proposed by the House and \$48,970,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for the identification, evaluation, and survey of islands in Minnesota and Michigan.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$3,032,000 for construction and maintenance instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,062,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes \$100,000 for the construction of an office building in Malta, Mont., and \$32,000 for development of the Fort Meade recreation complex on the Makotapi project in South Dakota.

##### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$114,690,300 for education and welfare services instead of \$114,475,000 as proposed by the House and \$115,061,300 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill provides an additional \$200,000 for the higher education program and \$15,300 for employment of a probation officer for the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, N. Dak.

The conferees are in agreement with the Senate proposal that of the amount recommended for resources management, the agricultural extension program shall be funded in the amount of \$1,767,000, the same amount as was available in fiscal year 1966; and that housing development will be funded at a level of \$1,209,000. This action will replace in the agriculture extension activity that amount which was proposed to be taken from it and added to the housing development program.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$56,118,000 for construction instead of \$55,325,000 as proposed by the House and \$56,848,000 as

proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$325,000 for construction of kitchen-dining facilities at Flandreau Indian School, South Dakota; and \$468,000 for construction of high school facilities at Maddock, N. Dak.

The conferees are in agreement with the proposal of the Senate for the allocation of the \$2,000,000 reduction made in the House bill to specific items in the construction program.

The conferees are also in agreement that in instances where water is a factor in the location of a school construction, funds are not to be requested until a site with an adequate water supply is found.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide \$468,000 to the Maddock, N. Dak., Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$16,889,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$16,754,000 as proposed by the House. The increase of \$135,000 over the House bill is for grading and surfacing the road between Grass Mountain and St. Francis on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Delete the language prohibiting the use of tribal funds to purchase land or water rights in Wyoming if such acquisition would result in the purchases being exempt from local taxation, as proposed by the Senate.

#### BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,910,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$3,960,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that \$50,000 of available funds shall be used for surveying recreational opportunities and recommending development of the Missouri River area between Yankton, S. Dak., and Fort Benton, Mont.

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

Amendment No. 10: Allocates \$65,703,000 of the land and water conservation fund for assistance to States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$76,203,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11: Allocates \$23,471,500 of the land and water conservation fund to the National Park Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,971,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12: Allocates \$18,093,000 of the land and water conservation fund to the Forest Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,093,000 as proposed by the House.

#### GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

Amendment No. 13. Appropriates \$80,032,000 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of \$72,782,000 as proposed by the House and \$80,932,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$6,000,000 for exploration and discovery programs relating to heavy metals in short supply in the United States; \$600,000 for matching State offerings for cooperative water



investigations; and \$650,000 to clear phreatophytic growth from the Gila River, Ariz.

Amendment No. 14. Provides a total of \$12,950,000 instead of \$12,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,250,000 as proposed by the Senate, to be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations.

The conferees are in agreement that at least \$50,000 of this additional amount will be made available by the Geological Survey to match state funds in order to commence a hydrologic survey of the Delmarva Peninsula.

#### BUREAU OF MINES

Amendment No. 15. Appropriates \$34,740,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of \$31,540,000 as proposed by the House and \$34,940,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase consists of an increase of \$3,500,000 for the development of production technologies of heavy metals which are in short supply in the United States, and a decrease of \$300,000 for the funding of a culm dump project in Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 16. Appropriates \$4,300,000 for solid waste disposal as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for a demonstration culm dump project in Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 17. Appropriates \$7,000,000 for Appalachian region mining area restoration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

#### BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Amendment No. 18. Appropriates \$20,701,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$20,312,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,076,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$90,000 for tail water research and expansion of biological investigations on Missouri River Reservoirs; and \$249,000 for expanded investigation, disappearance of migrating fish, upper reaches of Columbia River Basin; and \$50,000 for expanded development of the Pacific Hake Fishery Program.

Amendment No. 19. Appropriates \$2,675,000 for anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate, and deletes language "To remain available until expended".

#### BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

Amendment No. 20 Appropriates \$38,145,800 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$37,164,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,161,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: Operation and maintenance funds for the following fish hatcheries—\$50,000, Norfork, Ark.; \$27,000, Natchitoches, La.; \$136,500, Wytheville, Va.; \$59,900, Lahonton, Nev.; \$13,800, Gavins Point, S. Dak.; and \$10,500, Valley City, N. Dak.

In addition, \$40,000 for the establishment of a cooperative fishery unit, University of Washington; \$40,000 for financing the cooperative fishery units at Montana State College, Colorado State University,

Utah State University, and the University of Missouri at a \$40,000 annual level; \$16,000 for technical fishery management assistance, Aberdeen area, Bureau of Indian Affairs; \$43,100 additional operating funds, Piedmont Wildlife Refuge; \$200,000 predatory animal control; \$200,000 studies on artificial fishing reefs; \$20,000 for the determination of a suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky; and \$125,000 for research on control of Polynesian rats in Hawaii.

The conferees are in agreement that a review and analysis of the funding for the various cooperative wildlife research units shall be made by the Department and that the 1968 budget estimate shall provide uniform funding for these units at a level commensurate with the needs.

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$7,118,600 for construction instead of \$5,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,341,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$1,363,000 for improvements and additions at the following hatcheries—\$115,000, Williams Creek, Ariz.; \$334,000, Lahonton, Nev.; \$190,000, Valley City, N. Dak.; \$219,000, Creston, Mont.; \$121,000, New London, Minn.; \$95,000, Dexter, N. Mex.; \$224,000, Kooskia, Idaho; and \$65,000, Berlin, N.H.

Also included is \$636,600 for improvements and additions at the following wildlife refuges—\$148,600, Camp Cornelia, Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge, Ga.; \$100,000, Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, S. Dak.; \$38,000, Lake Andes National Wildlife Refuge, S. Dak.; \$200,000, Eufaula, Ala.

In addition, \$200,000 for the construction of a fish genetics laboratory at Beulah, Wyo.; \$16,000 for improvement of the access road to Interstate Highway 94, Northern States Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, N. Dak.; \$100,000 for continued rehabilitation, Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Okla.; and a decrease of \$177,000 for the operation of three national fish hatcheries, which amount has been transferred to the appropriation item for the management and investigations of resources.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$500,000 for Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$2,675,000 for anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate, and deletes language "to remain available until expended".

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates \$1,549,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$1,564,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$35,932,800 for management and protection instead of \$35,694,000 as proposed by the House and \$36,171,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes an additional \$82,500 for operation of new park areas and an additional \$156,300 for the operation of new facilities in existing park areas.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$22,894,000 for construction as proposed by the House instead of \$23,494,000 as proposed by the Senate.

## OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$4,704,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,650,000 as proposed by the House.

## OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$4,998,900 for salaries and expenses instead of \$4,984,100 as proposed by the House and \$5,051,700 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$14,800 is for one additional position in the Office of the Budget.

## TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

Amendment No. 29. Appropriates \$173,850,000 for forest land management instead of \$172,821,000 as proposed by the House and \$174,521,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$410,000 for construction of a dam at the Trout Pond Recreation Area, George Washington National Forest, W. Va.; \$25,000 for planning of a visitor center, Mammoth Lakes, Calif., Inyo National Forest; \$100,000 for recreation development, Monroe Reservoir, Wayne Hoosier National Forest, Ind.; \$100,000 for recreation management, Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Minn.; \$90,000 for additional recreational facilities, Lake Michigan Recreation Area, Mich.; \$105,000 for construction of a bathhouse, Lake Glendale, Shawnee National Forest, Ill.; \$85,000 for preparation of plans and specifications, headquarters building, Black Hills National Forest, Custer, S. Dak.; and \$114,000 for the installation of an elevator at Blanchard Springs Caverns, Ozark National Forest, Ark.

Amendment No. 30. Appropriates \$37,821,000 for forest research, instead of \$34,955,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,578,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$110,000 for the Beaver Creek project, Arizona watershed program; \$140,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Morgantown, W. Va.; \$50,000 additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Alexandria, La.; \$40,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Bottineau, N. Dak.; \$100,000 for Alpine snow and avalanche control research, Fort Collins, Colo.; \$125,000 for additional staffing at the Southern Hardwood Laboratory, Stoneville, Miss.; \$143,000 for preparation of design and specifications, Forest Service Laboratories—\$28,000, Lincoln, Nebr.; \$40,000, Burlington, Vt.; and \$75,000, Durham, N.H.; \$450,000 for construction of a Silviculture and Animal Problems Laboratory, Olympia, Wash.; \$690,000 for construction of a Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Carbondale, Ill.; \$1,000,000 for the construction of an addition to the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Athens, Ga.; and \$18,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Rapid City, S.Dak.



## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

## PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

## Indian Health Activities

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$73,671,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$73,250,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$100,000 to establish an areawide preventive mental health program in Alaska, and \$321,000 for the operation of a health clinic in Rapid City, S. Dak., to care for indigent Indians in that city.

The conferees are in agreement that \$250,000 of available funds which the House directed be used along with the increased appropriation of \$250,000 to combat trachoma, be restored to the hospital health services budget, and be distributed among consultant services to broaden medical coverage and improve quality of care, maintenance, and rehabilitation for overcoming the existing backlog in that work, and equipment.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$13,464,000 for construction of Indian health facilities instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,928,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes \$87,000 for the renovation of a building in Rapid City, S. Dak., for use as an outpatient clinic; \$93,000 planning funds for a Public Health Service Indian hospital at Claremore, Okla.; and \$284,000 for sanitation facilities.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

## CONSTRUCTION, RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

The conferees direct that this appropriation shall be available only after an amount equal to one-half of this appropriation has been provided by the District of Columbia as required by Public Law 89-177.

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Amendments Nos. 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37: Appropriate \$9,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill provides \$2,000,000 for the National Endowment for the Humanities under section 7(c) of the act.

Amendment No. 38: Adds Senate Language providing that no funds under this appropriation item may be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.

## SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$22,523,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$22,844,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that \$50,000 of available funds under this appropriation item shall be used by the Office of Exhibits for preparation of an Alaskan centenary exhibit.

## NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$2,718,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,694,000 as proposed by the House.

## CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$25,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN O. MARSH, Jr.,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN REIFEL,  
JOSEPH M. McDADE,  
FRANK T. BOW,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*







nature of souvenirs. The bulk of this material furthermore has been tendered to members of the Armed Forces. The last omnibus bill listing individuals by name devoted over 65 pages to the military and only 6 pages to civilians.

The Committee on Foreign Relations recommends this bill to the Senate with the committee amendments. It believes that this is an equitable way of solving a minor but nagging problem. Under the bill, every recipient will be treated absolutely alike and there will be no further occasions for special pleadings for this person and that group. For the first time, a uniform policy, applicable to all will have been established.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will approve this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### APPOINTMENT OF SENATOR GRIFFIN OF MICHIGAN AS A DELEGATE TO ATTEND THE NINTH CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP MEETING

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to Public Law 42 of the 86th Congress, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, announces the appointment of Senator ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Michigan, to attend the Ninth Canada-United

States Interparliamentary Group Meeting on May 18 through 22, 1966, at Washington, D.C., and Oak Ridge, Tenn., in lieu of Senator LEN B. JORDAN of Idaho, resigned.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 19, 1966, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 17, 1966:

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry E. Stebbins, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

# House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MAY 17, 1966

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*God is love, and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him.—I John 4: 16.*

O God, who art the Father of all, we thank Thee for every expression of Thy love to us, and for the experience of love we enjoy in the home, in our circle of friends, and here in the Halls of Congress. Strengthen Thou the ties that bind us together. Give us courtesy and consideration in our attitude toward one another. May we not allow our disagreements to make us disagreeable, or our differences to make a difference in our relationships, but now and always may the spirit of good will abide in our hearts. Keep us ever mindful of Thy presence, eager to do Thy will and loyal to the royal within ourselves as did Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 11, 1966:

H.R. 13365. An act to authorize the disposal of metallurgical grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13367. An act to authorize the disposal of acid grade fluorspar from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13368. An act to authorize the disposal of bismuth from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13371. An act to authorize the disposal of phlogopite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13373. An act to authorize the disposal of muscovite mica from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13578. An act to authorize the disposal of rhodium from the national stockpile;

H.R. 13579. An act to authorize the disposal of thorium from the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13580. An act to authorize the disposal of amosite asbestos from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13663. An act to authorize the disposal of ruthenium from the supplemental stockpile; and

H.R. 13774. An act to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile.

On May 13, 1966:

H.R. 14012. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 11487. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

## DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

Mr. DENTON, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on H.R. 14215, the appropriation bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1538)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) "making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9, 24, 26, 39, and 41.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 22, 27, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, and 40, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$48,855,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,032,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$114,690,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$56,118,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$80,032,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$12,950,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$34,740,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,701,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

"For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$38,145,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,118,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

"For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$35,932,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$4,998,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said



amendment insert "\$173,850,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$37,821,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,464,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 5.

WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN O. MARSH,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN REIFEL,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,  
FRANK T. BOW,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

CARL HAYDEN,  
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,  
ALAN BIBLE,  
ROBERT C. BYRD,  
KARL E. MUNDT,  
MILTON R. YOUNG,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

*Public Land Management*

*Bureau of Land Management*

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates \$48,855,000 for management of lands and resources instead of \$48,755,000 as proposed by the House and \$48,970,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill is for the identification, evaluation, and survey of islands in Minnesota and Michigan.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$3,032,000 for construction and maintenance instead of \$2,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,062,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes \$100,000 for the construction of an office building in Malta, Montana, and \$32,000 for development of the Fort Meade Recreation Complex on the Makotapi Project in South Dakota.

*Bureau of Indian Affairs*

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates \$114,690,300 for education and welfare services instead of \$114,475,000 as proposed by the House and \$115,061,300 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill provides an additional \$200,000 for the higher education program and \$15,300 for employment of a probation officer for the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, North Dakota.

The conferees are in agreement with the Senate proposal that of the amount recommended for resources management, the agricultural extension program shall be funded in the amount of \$1,767,000, the same amount as was available in fiscal year 1966; and that housing development will be funded at a level of \$1,209,000. This action will replace in the agriculture extension activity that amount which was proposed to be taken from it and added to the Housing Development Program.

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates \$56,118,000 for construction instead of \$55,325,000 as proposed by the House and \$56,848,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$325,000 for construction of kitchen-dining facilities at Flandreau Indian School, South Dakota; and \$468,000 for construction of high school facilities at Maddock, North Dakota.

The conferees are in agreement with the proposal of the Senate for the allocation of the \$2,000,000 reduction made in the House bill to specific items in the construction program.

The conferees are also in agreement that in instances where water is a factor in the location of a school construction, funds are not to be requested until a site with an adequate water supply is found.

Amendment No. 5: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to provide \$468,000 to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school.

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates \$16,889,000 for road construction (liquidation of contract authorization) as proposed by the Senate instead of \$16,754,000 as proposed by the House. The increase of \$135,000 over the House bill is for grading and surfacing the road between Grass Mountain and St. Francis on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, South Dakota.

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8: Delete the language prohibiting the use of tribal funds to purchase land or water rights in Wyoming if such acquisition would result in the purchases being exempt from local taxation, as proposed by the Senate.

*Bureau of Outdoor Recreation*

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$3,910,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$3,960,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement that \$50,000 of available funds shall be used for surveying recreational opportunities and recommending development of the Missouri River area between Yankton, South Dakota, and Fort Benton, Montana.

*Land and Water Conservation Fund*

Amendment No. 10: Allocates \$65,703,000 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for assistance to States as proposed by the Senate instead of \$76,203,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 11. Allocates \$23,471,500 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the National Park Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$17,971,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12. Allocates \$18,093,000 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund to the Forest Service as proposed by the Senate instead of \$13,093,000 as proposed by the House.

*Geological Survey*

Amendment No. 13. Appropriates \$80,032,000 for surveys, investigations, and research instead of \$72,782,000 as proposed by the House and \$80,932,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$6,000,000 for exploration and discovery programs relating to heavy metals in short supply in the United States; \$600,000 for matching State offerings for cooperative water investigations; and \$650,000 to clear phreatophytic growth from the Gila River, Arizona.

Amendment No. 14. Provides a total of \$12,950,000 instead of \$12,350,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,250,000 as proposed by the Senate, to be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations.

The conferees are in agreement that at least \$50,000 of this additional amount will be made available by the Geological Survey to match state funds in order to commence

a hydrologic survey of the Delmarva Peninsula.

*Bureau of Mines*

Amendment No. 15. Appropriates \$34,740,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources instead of \$31,540,000 as proposed by the House and \$34,940,000 as proposed by the Senate. The net increase consists of an increase of \$3,500,000 for the development of production technologies of heavy metals which are in short supply in the United States, and a decrease of \$300,000 for the funding of a culm dump project in Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 16. Appropriates \$4,300,000 for solid waste disposal as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill is for a demonstration culm dump project in Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 17. Appropriates \$7,000,000 for Appalachian Region mining area restoration as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

*Bureau of Commercial Fisheries*

Amendment No. 18. Appropriates \$20,701,000 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$20,312,000 as proposed by the House and \$21,076,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$90,000 for tail water research and expansion of biological investigations on Missouri River Reservoirs; and \$249,000 for expanded investigation, disappearance of migrating fish, upper reaches of Columbia River Basin; and \$50,000 for expanded development of the Pacific Hake Fishery program.

Amendment No. 19. Appropriates \$2,675,000 for Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate, and deletes language "to remain available until expended".

*Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife*

Amendment No. 20. Appropriates \$38,145,800 for management and investigations of resources instead of \$37,164,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,161,400 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: Operation and Maintenance funds for the following fish hatcheries—\$50,000, Norfolk, Arkansas; \$27,000, Natchitoches, Louisiana; \$136,500, Wytheville, Virginia; \$59,900, Lahonton, Nevada; \$13,800, Gavins Point, South Dakota; and \$10,500, Valley City, North Dakota.

In addition, \$40,000 for the establishment of a cooperative fishery unit, University of Washington; \$40,000 for financing the cooperative fishery units at Montana State College, Colorado State University, Utah State University, and the University of Missouri at a \$40,000 annual level; \$16,000 for technical fishery management assistance; Aberdeen area, Bureau of Indian Affairs; \$43,100 additional operating funds, Piedmont Wildlife Refuge; \$200,000 predatory animal control; \$200,000 studies on artificial fishing reefs; \$20,000 for the determination of a suitable site for a trout hatchery in Kentucky; and \$125,000 for research on control of Polynesian rats in Hawaii.

The conferees are in agreement that a review and analysis of the funding for the various cooperative wildlife research units shall be made by the Department and that the 1968 budget estimate shall provide uniform funding for these units at a level commensurate with the needs.

Amendment No. 21. Appropriates \$7,118,600 for construction instead of \$5,130,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,341,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$1,363,000 for improvements and additions at the following hatcheries—\$115,000, Williams Creek, Arizona; \$334,000, Lahonton, Nevada; \$190,000, Valley City, North Dakota; \$219,000, Creston, Montana; \$121,000, New London, Minnesota; \$95,000, Dexter, New Mexico; \$224,000, Koos-



Idaho; and \$65,000, Berlin, New Hampshire.

Also included is \$636,600 for improvements and additions at the following wildlife refuges—\$148,600, Camp Cornelia, Okefenokee Wildlife Refuge, Georgia; \$100,000, Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge, South Dakota; \$38,000, Lake Andes National Wildlife Refuge, South Dakota; \$200,000, Eufaula, Alabama;

In addition, \$200,000 for the construction of a fish genetics laboratory at Beulah, Wyoming; \$16,000 for improvement of the access road to Interstate Highway 94, Northern States Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, North Dakota; \$100,000 for continued rehabilitation, Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge, Oklahoma; and a decrease of \$177,000 for the operation of three national fish hatcheries, which amount has been transferred to the appropriation item for the management and investigations of resources.

Amendment No. 22. Appropriates \$500,000 for Appalachian Region fish and wildlife restoration projects as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23. Appropriates \$2,675,000 for Anadromous and Great Lakes fisheries conservation as proposed by the Senate, and deletes language "to remain available until expended".

Amendment No. 24. Appropriates \$1,549,000 for general administrative expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$1,564,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### National Park Service

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates \$35,932,800 for management and protection instead of \$35,694,000 as proposed by the House and \$36,171,600 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes an additional \$82,500 for operation of new park areas and an additional \$156,300 for the operation of new facilities in existing park areas.

Amendment No. 26: Appropriates \$22,894,000 for construction as proposed by the House instead of \$23,494,000 as proposed by the Senate.

#### Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 27: Appropriates \$4,704,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$4,650,000 as proposed by the House.

#### Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 28: Appropriates \$4,998,900 for salaries and expenses instead of \$4,984,100 as proposed by the House and \$5,051,700 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$14,800 is for one additional position in the Office of the Budget.

#### TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

##### Department of Agriculture

##### Forest Service

Amendment No. 29. Appropriates \$173,850,000 for forest land management instead of \$172,821,000 as proposed by the House and \$174,521,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$410,000 for construction of a dam at the Trout Pond Recreation Area, George Washington National Forest, West Virginia; \$25,000 for planning of a visitor center, Mammoth Lakes, California, Inyo National Forest; \$100,000 for recreation development, Monroe Reservoir, Wayne Hoosier National Forest, Indiana; \$100,000 for recreation management, Boundary Waters Canoe Area, Minnesota; \$90,000 for additional recreational facilities, Lake Michigan Recreation Area, Michigan; \$105,000 for construction of a bathhouse, Lake Glendale, Shawnee National Forest, Illinois; \$85,000 for preparation of plans and specifications, headquarters building, Black Hills National Forest, Custer, South Dakota; and \$114,000 for the installation of an elevator at Blanchard Springs Caverns, Ozark National Forest, Arkansas.

Amendment No. 30. Appropriates \$37,821,000 for forest research, instead of \$34,955,000 as proposed by the House and \$38,578,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase over the House bill includes: \$110,000 for the Beaver Creek project, Arizona watershed program; \$140,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Morgantown, West Virginia; \$50,000 additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Alexandria, Louisiana; \$40,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Bottineau, North Dakota; \$100,000 for Alpine snow and avalanche control research, Fort Collins, Colorado; \$125,000 for additional staffing at the Southern Hardwood Laboratory, Stoneville, Mississippi; \$143,000 for preparation of design and specifications, Forest Service Laboratories—\$28,000, Lincoln, Nebraska; \$40,000, Burlington, Vermont; and \$75,000, Durham, New Hampshire; \$450,000 for construction of a Silviculture and Animal Problems Laboratory, Olympia, Washington; \$690,000 for construction of a Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Carbondale, Illinois; \$1,000,000 for the construction of an addition to the Forestry Sciences Laboratory, Athens, Georgia; and \$18,000 for additional staffing at the Forest Service Laboratory, Rapid City, South Dakota.

#### Department of Health, Education and Welfare

##### Public Health Service

##### Indian health activities

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates \$73,671,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$73,250,000 as proposed by the House. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$100,000 to establish an area-wide preventive mental health program in Alaska; and \$321,000 for the operation of a health clinic in Rapid City, South Dakota to care for indigent Indians in that city.

The conferees are in agreement that \$250,000 of available funds which the House directed be used along with the increased appropriation of \$250,000 to combat trachoma, be restored to the Hospital Health Services budget, and be distributed among consultant services to broaden medical coverage and improve quality of care, maintenance, and rehabilitation for overcoming the existing backlog in that work, and equipment.

Amendment No. 32: Appropriates \$13,464,000 for construction of Indian Health facilities instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,928,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase provided over the House bill includes: \$87,000 for the renovation of a building in Rapid City, South Dakota for use as an outpatient clinic; \$93,000 planning funds for a Public Health Service Indian hospital at Claremore, Oklahoma; and \$284,000 for sanitation facilities.

#### National Capital Transportation Agency

##### Construction, Rail Rapid Transit System

The conferees direct that this appropriation shall be available only after an amount equal to one-half of this appropriation has been provided by the District of Columbia as required by Public Law 89-177.

#### National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

Amendments Nos. 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37: Appropriate \$9,000,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House. The increase over the House bill provides \$2,000,000 for the National Endowment for the Humanities under section 7(c) of the act.

Amendment No. 38: Adds Senate language providing that no funds under this appropriation item may be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.

#### Smithsonian Institution

Amendment No. 39: Appropriates \$22,523,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by

the House instead of \$22,844,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees are in agreement that \$50,000 of available funds under this appropriation item shall be used by the Office of Exhibits for preparation of an Alaskan Centenary Exhibit.

#### National Gallery of Art

Amendment No. 40: Appropriates \$2,718,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,694,000 as proposed by the House.

#### Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission

Amendment No. 41: Appropriates \$25,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$35,000 as proposed by the Senate.

WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,  
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN,  
JOHN O. MARSH,  
GEORGE MAHON,  
BEN REIFEL,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,  
FRANK T. BOW,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 101, on May 16, a quorum call, I am recorded as not answering to my name. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 9, I was granted an official leave of absence from the sessions of the House for the period of May 9 through May 16, for the purpose of traveling to Vietnam as a member of the Government Information and Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

With our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from California, the Honorable JOHN MOSS, we spent the week in a factfinding mission and held hearings on the overall situation of our assistance to the South Vietnamese people.

During this period I missed several rollcalls on which I would like to state my position on the legislation then under discussion.

On rollcall No. 91, on the amendment to restore the \$20 million for the rent supplement program, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 92, on the passage of the independent offices appropriation bill, I would have voted "aye."

On rollcall No. 94, on the passage of the Military Medical Benefits Act, to authorize an improved health benefits pro-







# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 19, 1966  
For actions of May 18, 1966  
89th 2nd; No. 82

## CONTENTS

Animal research.....30	Food for freedom.....5	Peanut butter.....16
Appropriations.....1	Forest Service.....1	Personnel.....34
Budget.....20	Forestry.....12	Postal rates.....3
CCC.....23	Heptonoic acid.....24	Poverty.....6
Chicory.....24	Household effects.....24	Public works.....31
Conservation.....8	Inflation.....10	REA.....36
Corkboard.....24	Information.....11	Recreation.....9,21
Cotton.....25,26	Lands.....22	Research.....13,30
Dairy farmer.....19,33	Loan pools.....2	River basin.....18
Dairy imports.....33	Meat imports.....15	Roads.....7
Disaster relief.....25,35	Military construction...23	Soybeans.....25
Electrification.....36	Opinion poll.....17	Stockpiling.....4
Farm prices.....27	Parity prices.....28	Tariff.....24
Farm program.....14,29	Participation sales.....2	Water pollution.....32

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill, including Forest Service. House passed participation sales bill. House committee voted to report food-for-freedom bill.

## HOUSE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, including Forest Service. (pp. 10378-82). See Digest 81 for a table reflecting the action of the conferees.
2. PARTICIPATION SALES. Passed with an amendment (to substitute the language of a similar bill, H. R. 14544) S. 3283, to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies. H. R. 14544, previously passed with amendments, was tabled. pp. 10382-413

3. POSTAL RATES. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 14904, to revise postal rates on certain fourth-class mail (H. Rept. 1543). p. 10459
4. STOCKPILING. Passed without amendment H. R. 13769, to authorize the disposal of cordage fiber (sisal) from the national stockpile. p. 10414
5. FOOD FOR FREEDOM. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 14929, amended, to promote international trade in agricultural commodities, to combat hunger and malnutrition, and to further economic development. p. D432
6. POVERTY. The Education and Labor Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 15111, the proposed Economic Opportunity Act of 1966. p. D432  
Rep. Rhodes, Pa., inserted an article, "Poverty War Does Vital Job Despite Flaws." p. 10422
7. ROADS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 14359, amended, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1968 and 1969 for the construction of certain highways. p. D433
8. CONSERVATION. Rep. Landrum commended the progress made in Ga. through participation in sound soil and water conservation measures. pp. 10426-7
9. RECREATION. Rep. Wylder protested the proposed building of two dams in the Grand Canyon. pp. 10429-30
10. INFLATION. Rep. Curtis inserted two articles taking "a highly critical look at the administration's policy to deal with inflation." pp. 10435-6
11. INFORMATION. Rep. Rhodes, Ariz., inserted the Republican Policy Committee statement urging enactment of the freedom of information bill. pp. 10437-8
12. FORESTRY. Rep. George W. Andrews commended the running of the first forestry special train in Ala. carrying top forestry, governmental, and industrial leaders to a field forestry demonstration. pp. 10442-4
13. RESEARCH. Received from Interior a proposed bill to authorize that Department to contract for scientific and technological research; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

#### ITEMS IN APPENDIX

14. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Tunney inserted Lionel Steinberg's statement on Calif. agriculture on the occasion of the visit of Under Secretary Schnittker. pp. A2678
15. MEAT IMPORTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Berry expressing "great alarm and fear" on the rapidly increasing meat imports. p. A2681
16. PEANUT BUTTER. Extension of remarks of Rep. O'Neal, Ga., calling attention to the nutritious value of peanut butter "the most important food in the school lunch program", and inserting an article, "Youngsters Cling to Peanut Butter." p. A2682



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

(Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, 1966, I introduced H.R. 12272 to amend section 902(b) and section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which sections provide that if a U.S. corporation owns 10 percent or more of the voting stock of a foreign or first-level corporation, and if such foreign corporation owns 50 percent or more of the voting stock of a second-level or a foreign subsidiary, the domestic parent corporation may credit its proportionate share of the subsidiary's taxes against dividends received. Under present law no credit is allowed to the U.S. corporation for foreign taxes paid by a foreign corporation beyond the second level.

The amendment proposed in H.R. 12272 would reduce the 50-percent requirement to 25 percent between the first and second levels and would include third-level foreign corporations in the tax credit structure if the 25-percent test is met.

After careful consideration, I feel that this legislation should also provide that in no event shall the parent corporation obtain the benefit of a tax credit unless the U.S. parent corporation owns directly or indirectly not less than 5 percent of the voting stock of the second- and third-level subsidiaries. This, in effect, would follow the present requirement of indirect ownership in second-level subsidiaries which is a minimum of 10 percent of 50 percent ownership or an aggregate of not less than 5 percent.

I am therefore introducing a new bill in lieu of H.R. 12272 to amend section 902(b) and section 902(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, which will also include an amendment requiring any parent domestic corporation to own at least 5 percent of the voting stock of the second or third level subsidiaries in order to be allowed a tax credit.

The economic benefits which would be derived from such action, as stated at the time H.R. 12272 was introduced, are as follows, all in the national interest:

First. Contribute to the U.S. balance of payments.

Second. Enable American business to expand and grow abroad with reduced amounts of American equity capital.

Third. Create a more favorable business climate abroad by furthering the increased participation of foreign local nations in their own foreign economy.

Fourth. Encourage a demand, wherever feasible, for raw materials, products and equipment to be supplied from sources within the United States rather than elsewhere, thereby benefiting our economy through increased employment and income.

As I said when I introduced the original bill, inasmuch as this proposed legislation, when enacted, will prove beneficial

to the economy of the United States, I urge the Ways and Means Committee to report it out and the Congress to enact this measure at the earliest practicable date.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE HENRY S. CAULFIELD

(Mr. KARSTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is my sad duty to inform the House that the Honorable Henry S. Caulfield, a Member of the House of Representatives from March 4, 1907 to March 3, 1909, passed away in St. Louis, Mo., on May 11.

Judge Caulfield had a distinguished career of public service. In addition to his term in the House of Representatives, he served as Governor of the State of Missouri, judge of the St. Louis Court of Appeals, city counselor, member of the St. Louis Public Library Board, counsel for the Board of Freeholders which drafted the St. Louis City Charter, member of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners, and director of public welfare for the city of St. Louis.

Among his many important accomplishments, during his tenure as Governor he established the Missouri Highway Patrol as a nonpolitical department, a reformatory for young offenders, and his recommendations resulted in the enactment of a small loan law to protect workers. In addition, a State budgetary system was formed and a survey commission, which he sponsored, subsequently resulted in modernization and improvement of State institutions and services. His administration was characterized by its freedom from partisan favor seekers.

Although he was a Republican, he did not hesitate to take issue with his party when he felt it was in error. He was sometimes the despair of Republican leaders in St. Louis but he achieved a personal independence and influence in councils of his party because of his reputation for integrity.

He is survived by three daughters, Mrs. Clarence M. Barksdale and Mrs. Justin J. Cordonnier of St. Louis, Mrs. Frances Galena, of Farmington, Mo., and a son, John D. Caulfield, of Highland, Ill. Surviving also are seven grandchildren and seven great-grandchildren.

I join with the other Members of the Missouri delegation in extending to his family our deepest sympathy. He was beloved by his many friends and his contributions to the welfare of his State and local community will long be remembered.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on last Monday I was unavoidably absent during rollcall Nos. 98 and 100. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both rollcalls.

#### ARE WE FAILING OUR FIGHTING MEN?

(Mr. FUQUA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and dismayed this morning to hear on an NBC radio news program that an American destroyer patrolling in the waters off South Vietnam was out of ammunition, but was continuing its patrol.

If this be true, it is a fantastic situation. The American people are calling on our servicemen to give their lives in the struggle for freedom in that strife torn area of the world, and for us not to provide them with defensive armament is unthinkable.

I do not vouch for the accuracy of the report, and if it is untrue, it is inaccurate reporting at its worst.

But if it is true, it is dereliction of our duty at its worst.

I call upon the Department of Defense for an immediate explanation to the American people and if this situation is a fact, then the Congress should have a full scale investigation of the entire matter.

The American people will not and should not tolerate our fighting forces not having the necessary equipment to do the job we are calling on them to do. I believe the Congress has consistently provided the necessary funds for the Department of Defense to carry out its mission. There is no reason for a situation of this type at any time.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an explanation of a bill dealing with unemployment compensation which the Committee on Ways and Means has just completed action on.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[The matter referred to appears in the Appendix.]

#### UNITED STATES FACING ANOTHER CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS?

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is reported that the Soviets have developed a new missile system which can be launched by remote control from containers hidden on the ocean floor.

In view of this news is it possible that the United States may once again face a crisis similar to the 1962 Russian missile removal from Cuba?

For some time now the Soviets have been expanding their ocean exploration projects in the South Atlantic, Caribbean, and Gulf of Mexico. Based in Cuba, Russian oceanography ships operating in the waters near the coast of Florida give real cause for concern. Mapping the ocean floor is a matter of high priority among Russian oceanographers.

The United States has already seen that our undersea technology leaves



much to be desired. It took 2 months to find our H-bomb lost off the coast of Spain. Would it take as long to detect Russian missiles submerged off the U.S. coast?

I urge the Defense Department to give higher priority to this Nation's efforts to win the "wet space race." The defense of this Nation may not rest with who gets to the moon first, but which world power controls the undersea.

#### CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 103 yesterday I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Accounts of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that there will be some rather important votes this afternoon. Does this committee have witnesses from outside the city, does the gentleman happen to know?

Mr. ALBERT. I do not know. I know that the request has been cleared with the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPS-COMB] and it has been cleared with the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### MODIFICATION OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR TODAY

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the Members of the House of a slight change in the program. We will now proceed with the consideration of the conference report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, but the stockpile bills will not be called up until after disposition of the bill H.R. 14544, sale of participations in Government agency loan pools.

#### INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 17, 1966.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the statement contained in the report, I wish to make the following additional statement:

The conference total is \$1,321,615,800.

The conference report compared with:

Appropriations, 1966	+\$14,705,330
Budget estimates, 1967	—18,644,700
House bill	+26,446,300
Senate bill	—8,139,200

In addition, the bill carries a borrowing authorization of \$26 million for the helium program.

Mr. Speaker, while the conference report provides a total of \$26,446,300 over the amount approved by the House for this bill, it is my opinion that the amount provided in the conference report represents a reasonable compromise between the amounts recommended by the Senate and the House.

To put this in proper perspective, I think it should be pointed out that \$16,850,000 of the increase over the House represents items that probably would have been included in the House bill if they had been submitted in proper form sufficiently early for the House to have considered them.

One of these items relates to an appropriation of \$2 million for the National Endowment for the Humanities. You will probably recall in my discussion of this bill on the floor of the House, I pointed out that this item was being passed over without prejudice by the House because the National Council on the Humanities had not been organized sufficiently early to present a comprehensive budget program for the 1967 fiscal year. Since passage of the bill by the House, the Council has been organized and a reasonable program has been formulated for the 1967 fiscal year. The original budget request for this activity was \$5 million, the conference report provides \$2 million, or a reduction of \$3 million. In the opinion of the conferees, this will provide sufficient funds for the first year's operation of the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Also included in the conference report is \$9,500,000 for the heavy metals pro-

gram which was not previously considered by the House. This was a budget amendment that went to the Senate after the bill had been passed by the House. The original budget request for this activity was \$10,300,000. The provision of these funds is to accelerate the programs of the Department of the Interior devoted to the exploration, discovery, and production technologies of heavy metals in short supply. Heavy metals include antimony-bismuth, mercury, precious metals—including gold, silver, platinum, palladium, osmium, and iridium—tantalum, and tin; and the heavy minerals, monazite and zircon.

The increased needs for these metals by both industry and Government have placed heavy demands on our known mineral reserves and resources. For example, preliminary figures for 1965 indicate production of 20,000 flasks of mercury and consumption of 80,000 flasks; projections for 1966 indicate a deficit of 20,000 to 55,000 flasks. The pattern is similar for silver; in 1964 industrial consumption alone was 3.3 times production in 1964. The Nation is almost totally dependent on outside sources for tin and platinum and heavily dependent on such sources for antimony and bismuth.

Improved knowledge for determining geochemical distribution of heavy metals and new geologic, geochemical, and geophysical concepts and techniques now make it possible to locate resources hitherto unrecognized or concealed. Recent development of new, more precise, lower cost, and more rapid assay techniques which can be brought into the field in portable laboratories make possible a scientific search for heavy metals on a scale never before attainable. Currently uneconomical deposits can be made workable by development of new mining and metallurgical methods. Greater knowledge of the geologic occurrence of the heavy metals, and the ability to discover mines and purify them for use will increase the supply of these important metals.

The third item not originally considered by the House involves \$5,350,000 for the anadromous fish program. These funds are provided to carry out the provisions of Public Law 89-304 approved October 30, 1965, for the conservation, development, and enhancement of the anadromous fishery resources within the several States and the Great Lakes.

The act contains a limitation on appropriation of these funds until June 30, 1970, during which time not more than \$25 million can be made available for purposes of the act.

This legislation was enacted too late during the last session of Congress to provide funding for its provisions in the 1967 budget estimate. This has proved to be a very popular program. Funds provided under this legislation are on a 50-50 matching basis with the States, and numerous States have already



pledged funds for their share of the cost of conducting this program in the respective States.

The remainder of the increases over the House bill represent an investment in the resources and the economy of this Nation, and also an expanded effort to improve the educational, sanitation and health facilities of the American Indian. For example slightly over \$2 million of

the increase over the House bill is for various services and facilities for the American Indian; \$600,000 is for matching State offerings for cooperative water investigations; and slightly over \$3.8 million of the increase is related to various activities connected with our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, all of the items in this conference report have received the

careful consideration of the conferees, and I believe the funding program as proposed in this conference report will provide a well-balanced financial plan for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1967, and merits the approval of the House.

At this point in the RECORD, I insert a summary tabulation of the action taken on the various items in this bill:

*Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, 1967*

Item	1966 appropriation	1967 budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—			
						1966 appropriation	Budget estimate	House	Senate
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR									
Public land management.....	\$305,679,000	\$324,074,000	\$320,835,000	\$323,506,300	\$322,210,300	+\$16,531,300	-\$1,863,700	+\$1,375,300	-\$1,296,000
Mineral resources.....	126,072,170	150,492,000	136,210,000	147,060,000	145,960,000	+19,887,830	-4,532,000	+9,750,000	-1,100,000
Fish, wildlife, and parks.....	227,092,300	196,684,100	199,179,000	211,094,600	207,627,200	-19,465,100	+10,943,100	+8,448,200	-3,467,400
Office of Saline Water.....	22,485,000	30,946,000	29,851,000	29,851,000	29,851,000	+7,366,000	-1,095,000		
Office of Water Resources Research.....	6,396,000	6,894,000	6,894,000	6,894,000	6,894,000	+498,000			
Office of the Solicitor.....	4,596,800	4,704,000	4,650,000	4,704,000	4,704,000	+107,200		+54,000	
Office of the Secretary.....	4,557,200	5,186,000	4,984,100	5,051,700	4,998,900	+441,700	-187,100	+14,800	-52,800
Total, definite appropriations.....	696,878,470	718,980,100	702,603,100	728,161,600	722,245,400	+25,366,930	+3,265,300	+19,642,300	-5,916,200
Total, appropriations of receipts.....	145,745,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	-21,079,000			
Total, borrowing authority.....	(16,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(+10,000,000)			
Total, title I, Interior.....	842,623,470	843,646,100	827,269,100	852,827,600	846,911,400	+4,287,930	+3,265,300	+19,642,300	-5,916,200
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES									
Department of Agriculture, Forest Service:									
Definite appropriations.....	330,021,000	329,518,000	328,203,000	333,526,000	332,098,000	+2,077,000	+2,580,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
Appropriation of receipts.....	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000				
Total, Forest Service.....	330,801,000	330,298,000	328,983,000	334,306,000	332,878,000	+2,077,000	+2,580,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.....	91,000	61,400	61,400	61,400	61,400	-29,600			
Commission of Fine Arts.....	123,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	-8,000			
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service: Indian health activities.....	82,644,000	88,870,000	87,250,000	88,599,000	88,135,000	+5,491,000	-735,000	+885,000	-464,000
Indian Claims Commission.....	347,000	438,000	382,000	382,000	382,000	+35,000	-56,000		
National Capital Planning Commission.....	818,000	7,244,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	+187,000	-6,239,000		
National Capital Transportation Agency.....	4,104,000	18,630,000	10,455,000	10,455,000	10,455,000	+6,351,000	-8,175,000		
National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.....	10,700,000	13,930,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-1,700,000	-4,930,000	+2,000,000	
National Council on the Arts.....	50,000					-50,000			
Public Land Law Review Commission.....	750,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	+157,000			
Smithsonian Institution.....	26,539,000	35,791,000	31,422,000	31,767,000	31,446,000	+4,907,000	-4,345,000	+24,000	-321,000
Civil War Centennial Commission.....	100,000					-100,000			
Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.....	1,425,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	25,000	-1,400,000	-10,000		-10,000
Lewis and Clark Trail Commission.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000				
Transitional grants to Alaska.....	5,376,000					-5,376,000			
Federal development planning committees for Alaska.....	174,000	190,000	190,000	190,000	190,000	+16,000			
Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.....	200,000					-200,000			
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	20,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	+60,000			
Total, definite appropriations.....	463,507,000	495,834,400	467,120,400	476,147,400	473,924,400	+10,417,400	-21,910,000	+6,804,000	-2,223,000
Total, appropriation of receipts.....	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000				
Total, title II, related agencies.....	464,287,000	496,614,400	467,900,400	476,927,400	474,704,400	+10,417,400	-21,910,000	+6,804,000	-2,223,000
Grand total:									
Definite appropriations.....	1,160,385,470	1,214,814,500	1,169,723,500	1,204,309,000	1,196,169,800	+35,784,330	-18,644,700	+26,446,300	-8,139,200
Appropriation of receipts.....	146,525,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	-21,079,000			
Borrowing authority.....	(16,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(+10,000,000)			
Total.....	1,306,910,470	1,340,260,500	1,295,169,500	1,329,755,000	1,321,615,800	+14,705,330	-18,644,700	+26,446,300	-8,139,200

(Mr. DENTON asked and was given permission to include at this point in the RECORD a summary tabulation of various items presented in the bill.)

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Interior has done an outstanding job in representing the managers of the House in the conference. He has made an adequate explanation. All of us who are managers on the part of the House have signed this report.

I hope the House will accept the report without modification. I heartily support it in the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

(Mr. McDADE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. McDADE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL].

(Mr. WIDNALL asked and was given

permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased at the action of the Members in supporting so overwhelmingly the amendment to save the Metropolitan Opera House, as a condition on the funds provided the National Arts Endowment.

This amendment was offered in the Senate by Senator KARL E. MUNDT, and is similar to the amendment which I wished to offer in the House in connection with the appropriation for the National Arts Endowment on April 5. My amendment was stricken on a point of order.

I pointed out at that time that many of our historic buildings and sites that



are rich in tradition, history, and architecture and of great cultural and artistic value are threatened by the bulldozers and the wrecking balls. Already, some 6,000 of our heritage of 12,000 most historically significant buildings have been destroyed, by progress of a kind which takes no account of history or cultural and artistic values. The Metropolitan Opera House was almost a victim of this kind of shortsighted progress.

The amendment voted by this House today has had a major role in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, and it establishes a precedent of major significance. Certainly no Federal funds should be used to destroy our historic landmarks and our cultural monuments. Saving these is a mark of our maturity as a nation.

It is with pleasure that I note that the New York State Legislature has passed overwhelmingly a measure to save the Metropolitan Opera House, and it is my hope that it will be signed by Governor Rockefeller, especially since it has had such overwhelming support.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, after all is said and done, as I understand it, this bill is \$26½ million more than when it left the House. Is that correct?

Mr. DENTON. That is correct, but as I have stated, \$16,850,000 of the increase is represented by three items not previously considered by the House which probably would have had the support of the House. Excluding these amounts, the net increase over the House is about \$9.5 million more.

Mr. GROSS. \$9.5 million more?

Mr. DENTON. \$9.5 million above the House bill, if we exclude the three items not previously considered by the House.

Mr. GROSS. Why should we take out three items?

Mr. DENTON. The reason is that had those items been considered by the House, they probably would have been approved.

Mr. GROSS. I have great respect for the gentleman from Indiana, but it is strictly an assumption when he says that if the items totaling nearly \$17 million had been considered by the House they would have been adopted. That is an assumption.

Mr. DENTON. Of course I cannot say for certain what the House would have done, but I do know that the subcommittee which handles these matters would have approved the items.

Mr. GROSS. By any possibility is there money in this bill for the new arts museum which is being proposed at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue; for a building to house some kind of so-called art?

Mr. DENTON. There are no funds in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I hope there never will be.

Mr. DENTON. I understand the gentleman's position.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he

may consume to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee a question concerning an item for funds for a school in Tularosa, N. Mex. This is a peripheral school which both Indian children and non-Indian children attend. My colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] and I testified for this project on the House side. When it went to the Senate side, the Senate put it in. The Senate has put it in 2 years in a row.

Could the gentleman from Indiana give me any words of encouragement about this proposal?

Mr. DENTON. I know how great the interest of the gentleman from New Mexico is in this project. I know how hard he has worked for the education of the Indians.

I assure the gentleman that the committee is sympathetic with his position. However, it was a matter of give and take on many of the items in conference. For New Mexico the House bill provided \$1,120,000 for construction of schools, including \$700,000 planning funds for the school at Albuquerque which will cost about \$12 million to build. For this reason, in considering the general school construction program, the Tularosa project was assigned a lower priority. I am sure we will give it careful consideration at a later time.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Indiana yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, so that I may obtain an expression from him on this same matter.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL].

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy. As he knows, my colleague from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER] and I have been very interested in securing funds for a school at Tularosa, N. Mex. As the gentleman very well knows, this is a peripheral school attended by both Indian and non-Indian children. We have been attempting to get money to concentrate the local school districts, because they are bonded to the utmost of their capacity, so that they can help build a new school to take care of both the Indian and the non-Indian children. We testified about this and talked about it before our committee here. Twice the Senate put it in the bill. Could the gentleman give me some indication of his feeling as to the merits of this project?

Mr. REIFEL. The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] is not excelled by any other person in his interest in the education of Indian children in New Mexico. The distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, has well stated the reason why this particular item was not accepted in conference. I would give the gentleman from New Mexico the same assurance as the chairman did that we will consider, at a later date, his request which has so

eloquently been put forward by him and his colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. WALKER], before our subcommittee. I am tremendously interested not only as a member of an Indian tribe, but as one who is also trying to help the Indian people get adjusted in our society, by attending mixed schools similar to the one presently operating with these improvements in the gentleman's district. I want to give him that assurance.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I understand that you retained additional funds in here for the fisheries program at the University of Massachusetts which I advocated but you did not go along with the Senate in the money that they inserted here for a wildlife management program at the University of Massachusetts. Is that correct?

Mr. REIFEL. That is correct.

Mr. CONTE. I was quite disappointed in this. It is a very small sum of money, amounting to only \$15,000, as I understand it. Could you give me any reassurance that your committee is going to give this some serious consideration next year and see that we get this money back in there?

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts that this matter is being given serious consideration. This same request is coming from other State institutions, universities, and colleges, throughout the country. This subject was seriously discussed in conference, and it is hoped by next year a uniform policy will be developed, because it is felt that all institutions ought to be given uniform and equitable consideration. The Department of the Interior has been requested to take action in this regard. Perhaps the chairman of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] has additional comment on this.

Mr. DENTON. I think the gentleman has stated our position very well. I would only add that the conference report contains instructions to the Department of the Interior to give this matter consideration in the formulation of the 1968 budget estimates.

Mr. CONTE. As I understand it from both the chairman and the ranking minority member, there is one university in the United States receiving \$40,000 for their wildlife management.

Mr. DENTON. There is one funded at that level, yes.

Mr. CONTE. And you have asked for a policy statement on it?

Mr. DENTON. That is right.

Mr. CONTE. And next year we can look forward to where either all of them will have \$40,000 or all of them will be brought down to a lower figure?

Mr. DENTON. We have instructed the Department to review this matter, but I do not know what their recommendation will be.



Mr. CONTE. I will go along with the committee this year, but will not go along with it again. If one university is allowed \$40,000 for its wildlife management program, then every State university should be allowed the same amount of money. We should not discriminate here. You cannot make fish of one and fowl of another. You rest assured I will be watching this item next year and hope that the committee will go along with full funding of this program.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. WALKER of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to say that I appreciate the sympathy and consideration that this group has given to the Tularosa School District, and I would hope that next year we can proceed with this project, because it is important, not only to the white children, but to the Indian children, that we give this school help.

Mr. Speaker, I have found that during the short time I have been here, we have spent considerable sums of money and that we have given a lot of attention to the world insofar as education is concerned. I believe it is only proper that we take care of some of our own people. I thank the gentleman from Indiana very much for yielding to me this time.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the House conferees for the action taken in conference to improve the funding picture for Indian programs, especially those in Oklahoma which had been severely cut in the budget.

The conference changes are a substantial victory for the Indian extension and housing programs in Oklahoma, and are deeply appreciated.

The \$93,000 for planning of a new Public Health Service hospital at Claremore, Okla., will pave the way to construction of a new facility which is urgently needed. I hope there will be no further delay in construction of this new hospital.

The undertaking of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Honorable WINFIELD DENTON, and of his great subcommittee, is very much appreciated.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 10, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—378

Abernethy	Duncan, Oreg.	King, N.Y.
Adair	Duncan, Tenn.	King, Utah
Adams	Dwyer	Kirwan
Addabbo	Dyal	Kluczynski
Albert	Edmondson	Kornegay
Anderson, Ill.	Edwards, Ala.	Kunkel
Anderson, Tenn.	Edwards, Calif.	Kupferman
Andrews,	Erlenborn	Landrum
George W.	Evans, Colo.	Langen
Andrews,	Everett	Latta
Glenn	Evins, Tenn.	Lennon
Andrews,	Fallon	Lipscomb
N. Dak.	Farbstein	Long, La.
Annunzio	Farnsley	Love
Arcadis	Farnum	McCarthy
Ashbrook	Fascell	McClary
Ashley	Feighan	McCulloch
Ashmore	Findley	McDade
Aspinall	Fino	McDowell
Ayres	Fisher	McEwen
Bandstra	Flood	McFall
Barrett	Flynt	McGrath
Bates	Foley	McMillan
Battin	Ford, Gerald R.	McVicker
Beckworth	Ford,	Macdonald
Belcher	William D.	Machen
Bell	Fountain	Mackay
Bennett	Fraser	Mackie
Berry	Frelinghuysen	Madden
Betts	Friedel	Mahon
Bingham	Fulton, Pa.	Mailliard
Blatnik	Fulton, Tenn.	Marsh
Boland	Fuqua	Martin, Ala.
Bolton	Garmatz	Martin, Nebr.
Bow	Gathings	Matsunaga
Brademas	Gettys	Matthews
Bray	Gialmo	May
Brooks	Gibbons	Meeds
Broomfield	Gilbert	Miller
Brown, Calif.	Gilligan	Mills
Brown, Clar-	Gonzalez	Minish
ence J., Jr.	Grabowski	Mink
Broyhill, N.C.	Gray	Minshall
Broyhill, Va.	Green, Oreg.	Mize
Buchanan	Green, Pa.	Moeller
Burke	Griegg	Monagan
Burleson	Grider	Moore
Burton, Calif.	Griffiths	Moorhead
Burton, Utah	Grover	Morgan
Byrne, Pa.	Gubser	Morris
Byrnes, Wis.	Gurney	Morse
Cabell	Hagen, Calif.	Morton
Cahill	Haley	Mosher
Callan	Halleck	Multer
Callaway	Halpern	Murphy, Ill.
Cameron	Hamilton	Murphy, N.Y.
Carey	Hanley	Natcher
Casey	Hanna	Nedzi
Cederberg	Hansen, Iowa	Nelsen
Chamberlain	Hansen, Wash.	O'Brien
Chelf	Hardy	O'Hara, Ill.
Clancy	Harsha	O'Hara, Mich.
Clark	Harvey, Ind.	O'Konski
Clausen,	Harvey, Mich.	Olsen, Mont.
Don H.	Hathaway	Olson, Minn.
Clawson, Del	Hawkins	O'Neal, Ga.
Cleveland	Hays	O'Neill, Mass.
Clevenger	Hechler	Ottinger
Cohelan	Helstoski	Passman
Conable	Henderson	Patman
Conte	Herlong	Patten
Conyers	Hicks	Pelly
Cooley	Holifield	Perkins
Craley	Holland	Philbin
Cramer	Horton	Pickle
Culver	Howard	Pike
Cunningham	Hull	Pirnie
Curtin	Hungate	Poage
Daddario	Huot	Poff
Dague	Hutchinson	Pool
Daniels	Ichord	Price
Davis, Ga.	Irwin	Pucinski
Dawson	Jacobs	Purcell
de la Garza	Jarman	Quile
Delaney	Jennings	Quillen
Dent	Joelson	Race
Denton	Johnson, Calif.	Randall
Derwinski	Johnson, Okla.	Redlin
Devine	Johnson, Pa.	Rees
Dickinson	Jones, Ala.	Reid, Ill.
Diggs	Jones, Mo.	Reid, N.Y.
Dingell	Jones, N.C.	Reifel
Dole	Karsten	Reinecke
Donohue	Karth	Reuss
Dorn	Kastenmeier	Rhodes, Ariz.
Dow	Kee	Rhodes, Pa.
Dowdy	Keith	Rivers, S.C.
Downing	Kelly	Rivers, Alaska
Dulski	Keogh	Roberts
	King, Calif.	Robison

Rodino	Sisk	Tunney
Rogers, Colo.	Skubitz	Tuten
Rogers, Fla.	Slack	Udall
Rogers, Tex.	Smith, Calif.	Ullman
Ronan	Smith, Iowa	Utt
Rooney, Pa.	Smith, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Rosenthal	Smith, Va.	Vanik
Rostenkowski	Springer	Vigorito
Roudebush	Stafford	Waggonner
Roush	Staggers	Walker, N. Mex.
Roybal	Stalbaum	Watkins
Rumsfeld	Stanton	Watson
Ryan	Steed	Watts
Satterfield	Stephens	Weitner
St Germain	Stratton	Whalley
St. Onge	Stubblefield	White, Idaho
Saylor	Sullivan	White, Tex.
Scheuer	Sweeney	Whitener
Schisler	Talcott	Whitten
Schmidhauser	Taylor	Widnall
Schneebell	Teague, Calif.	Wolf
Schweiker	Tenzer	Wright
Secrest	Thomas	Wyatt
Selden	Thompson, N.J.	Yates
Senner	Thompson, Tex.	Young
Shipley	Thomson, Wis.	Younger
Shriver	Todd	Zablocki
Sickles	Trimble	
Sikes	Tuck	

NAYS—10

Brock	Gross	Walker, Miss.
Curtis	Hall	Wydler
Davis, Wis.	Jonas	
Goodell	Laird	

NOT VOTING—43

Abbitt	Hansen, Idaho	Powell
Baring	Hébert	Resnick
Boggs	Hosmer	Roncalio
Bolling	Krebs	Rooney, N.Y.
Carter	Leggett	Scott
Celler	Long, Md.	Teague, Tex.
Collier	MacGregor	Toll
Colmer	Martin, Mass.	Tupper
Corbett	Mathias	Vivian
Corman	Michel	Williams
Edwards, La.	Morrison	Willis
Ellsworth	Moss	Wilson, Bob
Fogarty	Murray	Wilson,
Gallagher	Nix	Charles H.
Hagan, Ga.	Pepper	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rooney of New York with Mr. Corbett.  
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bob Wilson.  
Mr. Krebs with Mr. Collier.  
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Michel.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Carter.  
Mr. Toll with Mr. Ellsworth.  
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Hosmer.  
Mr. Celler with Mr. Mathias.  
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Tupper.  
Mr. Williams with Mr. MacGregor.  
Mr. Corman with Mr. Scott.  
Mr. Nix with Mr. Baring.  
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Gallagher.  
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Willis.  
Mr. Vivian with Mr. Powell.  
Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Long of Maryland.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Edwards of Louisiana.  
Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Moss.  
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Murray.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment Numbered 5: Page 7, line 2: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$918,000 shall be for assistance to the Tularosa, New Mexico, School District No. 4 for



construction of junior high and high school facilities, and to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school."

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DENTON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$468,000 shall be for assistance to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which action was taken on the motion was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

#### PARTICIPATION SALES ACT OF 1966

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 14544) to promote private financing of credit needs and to provide for an efficient and orderly method of liquidating financial assets held by Federal credit agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 14544, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read through section 1, ending on line 4, page 1 of the bill.

If there are no amendments to the section, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 302(c) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(c)";

(2) by inserting after "undertakings and activities" a comma and "hereinafter in this subsection called 'trusts'";

(3) by striking out the words "offered to it by the Housing and Home Finance Agency or its Administrator, or by such Agency's constituent units or agencies or the heads thereof, or any first mortgages in which the United States or any agency" in the first sentence thereof and by inserting "and other types of

securities, including any instrument community known as a security, hereinafter in this subsection called 'obligations,' in which the United States or any executive department, agency,";

(4) by striking out the third sentence thereof and substituting therefor the following: "Participations or other instruments issued by the Association pursuant to this subsection shall to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission,"; and

(5) by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

(b) Section 302(c) of such Act is further amended by adding the following:

"(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the head of any executive department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States, hereinafter in this subsection called the 'trustor', is authorized to set aside a part or all of any obligations held by him and subject them to a trust or trusts and, incident thereto, may guarantee to the trustee timely payment thereof. The trust instrument may provide for the issuance and sale of beneficial interests or participations, by the trustee, in such obligations or in the right to receive interest and principal collections therefrom; and may provide for the substitution or withdrawal of such obligations, or for the substitution of cash for obligations. The trust or trusts shall be exempt from all taxation. The trust instrument may also contain other appropriate provisions in keeping with the purposes of this subsection. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Association may be named and may act as trustee of any such trusts and, for the purposes thereof, the title to such obligations shall be deemed to have passed to the Association in trust: *Provided*, That the trust instrument shall provide that custody, control, and administration of the obligations shall remain in the trustor subjecting the obligations to the trust, subject to transfer to the trustee in event of default or probable default, as determined by the trustee, in the payment of principal and interest of the beneficial interests or participations. Collections from obligations subject to the trust shall be dealt with as provided in the instrument creating the trust. The trust instrument shall provide that the trustee will promptly pay to the trustor the full net proceeds of any sale of beneficial interests or participations to the extent they are based upon such obligations or collections. Such proceeds shall be dealt with as otherwise provided by law for sales or repayment of such obligations. The effect of both past and future sales of any issue of beneficial interests or participations shall be the same, to the extent of the principal of such issue, as the direct sale of the obligations subject to the trust. Any trustor creating a trust or trusts hereunder is authorized to purchase, through the facilities of the trustee, outstanding beneficial interests or participations to the extent of the amount of his responsibility to the trustee on beneficial interests or participations outstanding, and to pay his proper share of the costs and expenses incurred by the Federal National Mortgage Association as trustee pursuant to the trust instrument, and for these purposes may use any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related.

"(3) If any trustor shall guarantee to the trustee the timely payment of obligations he subjects to a trust pursuant to this subsection, and it becomes necessary for such trustor to meet his responsibilities under such guaranty, he is authorized to fulfill such guaranty by using any appropriated

funds or other amounts available to him for the general purposes or programs to which the obligations subjected to the trust are related.

"(4) The Association, as trustee, is authorized to issue and sell beneficial interests or participations under this subsection, notwithstanding that aggregate receipts from obligations subject to the related trust are or may become insufficient in amount to provide for the payment by the trustee (on a timely basis out of current receipts or otherwise) of all interest or principal on such interests or participations (after provision for all costs and expenses incurred by the trustee, fairly prorated among trustors): *Provided*, That no such beneficial interests or participations shall be issued in relation to any obligations unless the trustee determines there is a reasonable probability there will not be an insufficiency as aforesaid, or unless the amounts issued are within aggregate principal amounts authorized in advance in appropriation Acts, and it shall be in order to include provisions authorizing such issuance in an appropriation Act. Whenever such an aggregate principal amount is so authorized, there shall be established on the books of the Treasury as indefinite appropriations such sums as may be necessary from time to time to enable the trustor to pay the trustee such insufficiency as the trustee may require on account of outstanding beneficial interests are participations, and such trustor shall make timely payments to the trustee from such appropriations, subject to and in accord with the trust instrument."

Mr. PATMAN (during reading the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of this section, down to page 7, line 7, be dispensed with, with the understanding that it will be subject to amendment at any point and also subject to any points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made the proposition that points of order would be reserved.

Mr. Chairman, I have several points of order. I would like to have it understood that I shall have an opportunity to present these points of order at the appropriate time, which should be right now, or as soon as this unanimous-consent request is put, I would assume, because of the points of order apply to that part of the bill which the gentleman under his unanimous-consent request would dispense with reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from North Carolina that if the request of the gentleman from Texas is granted, it will be in order for the gentleman to offer any points of order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 4, line 22, beginning with the word "and", which language is as follows: "and for these purposes may use any appropriated funds or other amounts available to him for the general







# DIGEST of Congressional Proceedings

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20250  
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID  
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
FOR INFORMATION ONLY;  
(NOT TO BE QUOTED OR CITED)

Issued May 20, 1966  
For actions of May 19, 1966  
89th-2nd; No. 83

## CONTENTS

Acreage allotments...14,22	Household effects.....3	Rural development.....7
Adjournment.....12,19	Lands.....6,22	School milk.....11
Appropriations.....1	Legislative program.....18	Social security.....29
Corkboard.....3	Loan pools.....2,17,25	Soil conservation.....20
Corn.....16	Military service.....26	Soybeans.....27
Education.....9	Minimum wage.....18	Sugar.....14
Electrification.....8	Oceanography.....15	Surplus property.....28
Ethics.....31	Participation	Transportation.....21
Exposition.....4	sales.....2,17,25	Veterans.....26
Farm prices.....10	Personnel.....5	Water pollution.....30
Food.....16	Poverty.....23	Water project.....24
Foreign trade.....3	REA.....8	Water supply.....13
Forest Service.....1	Recreation.....6	World food.....16
Forestry.....6	Review committees.....14	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on Interior appropriation bill, including FS. Senate considered motion to agree to House version of participation sales bill.

## SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 14215, the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill, including Forest Service items. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10532-41

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 14266, the Treasury-Post Office-Executive Office appropriation bill (S. Rept. 1178). pp. 10471-2

2. PARTICIPATION SALES. Began debate on a motion by Sen. Muskie to concur in the House version of S. 3283, the participation sales bill. pp. 10524-9, 10531-2
3. FOREIGN TRADE. Passed without amendment H. R. 8376, to make permanent the duty free treatment for certain corkboard insulation, which had been reported without amendment earlier in the day by the Finance Committee (S. Rept. 1170). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10487, 10463  
Passed without amendment H. R. 12864, to make permanent the duty-free treatment of personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders, which had been reported without amendment earlier in the day by the Finance Committee (S. Rept. 1176). This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 10488-9, 10463  
Sen. Ribicoff inserted an address by R. C. Fenton, "Investment Abroad and the Balance of Payments." pp. 10507-9
4. EXPOSITION. Received a Commerce Department report on U. S. participation in the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center. p. 10467
5. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a proposed bill to amend Sec. 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, restricting promotions and transfers; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. p. 10467
6. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2264, to authorize this Department to accept a cash equalization of exchanges for its lands (S. Rept. 1181), and H. R. 10366, to establish the Mount Rogers National Recreation Area, Jefferson National Forest, Va. (S. Rept. 1182 p. 10472  
Received a Calif. Legislature resolution favoring additional fire protection on the national forests. p. 10468
7. RURAL DEVELOPMENT. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendments S. 902, to authorize this Department to cooperate with States and other public agencies in planning for changes in the use of agricultural land in rapidly expanding urban areas and in other non-agricultural use areas (S. Rept. 1180). p. 10472
8. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Miller spoke in favor of S. 3337, to provide for supplemental REA financing, but said he understood the administration version would not be introduced in the Senate. Agreed to Sen. Cooper's request that the bill be held at the desk until May 20 for addition of cosponsors. pp. 10484-5
9. EDUCATION. Sen. Kuchel recommended continuation of educational assistance for federally impacted areas. pp. 10498-9
10. FARM PRICES. Sen. Carlson said farmers are not to blame for inflation and inserted an article on this subject. p. 10500
11. SCHOOL MILK. Sen. Proxmire spoke against budget cuts in the school milk program. p. 10506
12. ADJOURNED until Mon., May 23. p. 10557



agrees to assume responsibility for administration as a trustee of the lands until compensation is determined. A proviso specifically protect existing private rights, if any, in the lands, and exempts the lands in the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project and the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge.

Section 3 directs reservation to the Federal government of all minerals in the conveyed lands, except those in brines or precipitated or extracted from brines. The minerals so reserved are withdrawn from appropriation under the mining laws, but at the discretion of the Secretary the deposits may be developed under the mineral leasing laws. A proviso makes State use of the lands the dominant use.

Section 4 provides that as a condition of the conveyance of the lands below the meander line, the State in its turn shall quitclaim to the Federal government its interests in the lands above or upland from the meander line. These interests are those based on the fact that such lands might at one time have been covered by the waters of the lake, or that they may be so covered sometime in the future. A second provision requires that the State agree to pay the fair market value of the lands conveyed, including the minerals in the brines or precipitated or extracted from the brines. In lieu of money alone, the Secretary may accept as payment or part payment property or rights to property of the State, including mineral rights, and the relinquishment of the State's right to select certain public lands.

Section 5 confers on the State the choice, to be made within 9 months of enactment, of alternative actions with respect to settlement of the amount of compensation. First, it may request the Secretary to determine the fair market value of the lands and minerals conveyed as of the date of completion of the survey.

Or, as an alternative, the State may initiate an action in the Supreme Court of the United States for a judicial determination of the extent of the Federal government's rights, title and interest in the lands conveyed. Consent to joinder of the United States as a defendant in such an action is expressly given.

Within two years of the completion of the court action, the Secretary shall determine the fair market value of the lands and minerals conveyed which are found to have been owned by the United States prior to the conveyance. The values shall be determined as of the date of the Court's decision, rather than at the time of the closing of the meander line, as provided by the first alternative.

Failure of the State to elect one of the foregoing two alternative actions within nine months of the date of enactment will nullify the conveyance. Under the first alternative, the Secretary must transmit his findings as to fair market value within two years after the request, and the State must make payment within two years after receiving the determination.

Under the second alternative also the State must make payment within two years of receiving the Secretary's determination, based on the Supreme Court's decision.

Section 6 authorizes the State to issue leases, permits or licenses for utilization of the conveyed lands and resources immediately after it agrees to assume the obligation to administer the lands as a trustee, pending settlement of the amount and manner of the compensation to be paid to the Federal government. Revenues received by the State from such development shall be paid to the United States for the credit of the State, until the full amount of the compensation has been paid. In the event the State adopts the second alternative and the Supreme

Court finds the United States had no property rights in the lands conveyed, then such revenues shall be returned to the State without interest.

The second paragraph of section 6 provides that if the conveyance becomes null and void for any reason, then the leases, licenses or permits issued by the State under the authority of this section shall be deemed instruments issued by the Federal government and shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with their terms.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as the original sponsor of the Great Salt Lake Shoreline legislation in the 87th Congress, I am much pleased to see that this long controversy is about to be resolved. I recommend that the Senate adopt the Senate-House conference report as quickly as possible so that the bill can be prepared for the President's signature.

Now that this longstanding conflict is about to be resolved, the State of Utah will be able to move ahead and plan for the early development of hitherto untapped natural resources around and in Great Salt Lake. One provision in the conference report calls for action by the Utah State Legislature, and I am pleased to report that as soon as this bill becomes law the legislature, which is currently in special session, can dispose of the bill quickly itself.

I am also pleased to see that the Senate-House conferees generally have agreed that Utah's claim to the lands around the lake will be protected as will the rights of the Federal Government and of the private individuals or groups who own land around the lake.

The conference committee has recommended an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House amendment to the Senate bill. The substitute contains features from both the Senate and the House versions and provides for conveyance to the State of Utah of the interests of the United States in relicted lands surrounding Great Salt Lake below the established meander line, for the surveys necessary to close the line, for the protection of valid existing rights in third parties, for the United States to retain ownership of lands it now holds within the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge and the Weber Basin Federal reclamation project, for payment by the State to the United States in cash or equivalent of the fair market value of the interests transferred to it by the United States, for the State to manage the lands pending final resolution of questions of ownership or compensation, and for the State to relinquish any claim to lands lying above the meander line which may heretofore or may hereafter become submerged by the water in the lake.

Mr. President, the conference committee has solved the differences between the two versions by requiring the State of Utah to elect whether to pay the fair market value of the land transferred to it or to institute suit in the Supreme Court to test the United States claim of title.

This election must be made within 9 months after the Secretary of Interior completes the closing of the meander line.

In addition, the conference report pro-

vides that if the State elects to pay fair market value, the Secretary of Interior shall determine that value as of the date of the completed survey. If the State elects to sue and the judgment is in favor of the United States, the State will be bound to pay the fair market value as of the date of judgment as determined by the Secretary. If payment is not made within 2 years after receipt of the Secretary's determination the conveyance becomes null and void.

The bill also provides that the conveyance shall reserve to the United States all minerals "except brines and minerals in solution in the brines or precipitated or extracted therefrom." The value of the latter will be a part of the total fair market value to be paid by the State. The mineral reservation extends to "whatever Federal lands there may be below the meander line of the Great Salt Lake."

Mr. President, legislation is nothing more than compromise, and it is my feeling that the compromise we have before us today will resolve the longstanding question of who owns the land. Before the passage of this bill and because of the nature of the lake it was conceivable that a firm on the shores of the lake would find itself one day under jurisdiction of the Federal Government and the next under jurisdiction of the State government as far as the land is concerned.

I recommend the early adoption of the conference report, so that the State and the Federal Government can begin to receive the benefits for the potential industry that is there.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand there will be nothing further during the day in connection with the conference report which deals with the sale of about \$11 billion worth of Government assets.

I think that the Senate made a wise decision to postpone this matter until Monday in order that Senators may examine the bill and vote more intelligently.

There may not be too much difference between the two versions of the bill, but we cannot escape the fact that this represents a major change of Government policy in financing its expenditures. The proposal involves the authorization of the sale of about \$11 billion of our assets, the proceeds of which can be used to defray regular operating expenses of the Government and thereby reduce the amount of the deficit as will be reported by the Government.

There are some of us who feel strongly that this is a deceitful method of financing and that it does not tell the American people the truth in regard to the cost of these Great Society programs.



For that reason we strongly object to any effort to steamroller this bill through without Senators having had an opportunity to read it.

I am not unmindful of the fact that this legislation as first presented called for an authority to sell \$33 billion of assets.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of West Virginia took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senate held but 2 days of hearings on the bill, which deals with a \$33 billion authorization; but, what is worse, the RECORD shows that the first day's hearings were held before the bill had even been introduced. The second day's hearings were finished before the bill had returned from the printer. It was reported the same day, and on the very next day it was made the pending business before the Senate.

There has been an unusual rush to have this bill passed ever since it was first discovered by the White House that this might be a convenient method to make it look like they are balancing the budget. Had it passed as it was originally introduced, the Government could have spent, for the next 3 years, \$10 billion a year more than it is taking in, while still reporting a balanced budget. This is deceitful.

Under the bill in its modified form, which is \$20 billion lower than the original request, the administration can spend between \$10 billion and \$11 billion next year more than it will be taking in and still deceive the American people by telling them they have a balanced budget. The President, in his message to Congress, advocated truth in lending and truth in packaging; I strongly suggest that the White House lend its support to a policy of truth in Government.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senate has been discussing House action on S. 3283. For the RECORD, I should like to report that under today's date I received a communication from Joseph W. Barr, Under Secretary of the Treasury, with respect to an amendment which I offered, which was accepted and made a

part of the bill when the Senate passed it, but was omitted by the House.

Let me read Mr. Barr's letter:

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: The asset sales bill as passed by the House omitted your amendment to section 8 which would have required the Secretary of the Treasury to make an annual report to the Congress regarding loans held by Federal agencies, participation sales and the effect of participation sales on the deficit or surplus in the administrative budget.

Let me assure you that the Treasury Department will make such a report on a voluntary basis in accordance with the intent of your amendment. Treasury staff will be available to your staff at any time to work out the details and timing of the report procedure.

Since the bill has now gone over until Monday for action, I thought I had better get this statement in today's RECORD, in the off chance that I might not be available on the floor during the limited time which has been set for consideration of the bill.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding to me and giving me the opportunity to make this statement.

Mr. BIBLE. I am happy to oblige the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate, it provided for appropriations totaling \$1,329,755,000 for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior, exclusive of the Bureau of Reclamation and power marketing agencies, and the various related agencies, including the U.S. Forest Service.

The conference committee bill provides appropriations totaling \$1,321,615,800 for the programs and activities of these agencies. This total is under the budget estimates of \$1,340,260,500 by \$18,644,700; over the House bill of \$1,295,169,500 by \$26,446,300; and under the Senate bill of \$1,329,755,000 by \$8,139,200.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a tabulation setting out the appropriation for the current year, the budget estimate, the House allowance, the Senate allowance, and the conference allowance for each appropriation in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the House conferees concurred with \$9,500,000 of the \$10,300,000 budgeted for the heavy metals program which had not been considered by the House of Representatives. The House also concurred in the Senate's provision of funds to implement the anadromous fisheries program which was authorized by law approved last October.

In addition, there is agreement on the \$2 million allowed by the Senate for the National Foundation on the Humanities. Furthermore, the Senate's distribution of the Land and Water Conservation Act funds has been accepted by the House.

The conference was a most friendly, cooperative meeting. I believe that the report deals very fairly with the actions and views of both branches of the Congress.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.  
(For conference report, see House proceedings of May 17, 1966, pp. 10314-10315, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

#### EXHIBIT 1

##### Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE 1—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR								
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT								
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT								
Management of lands and resources.....	\$50,575,000	\$48,755,000	\$48,755,000	\$48,970,000	\$48,855,000	+\$100,000	+\$100,000	—\$115,000
Construction and maintenance.....	3,150,000	2,900,000	2,900,000	3,062,000	3,032,000	+132,000	+132,000	—30,000
Public lands development roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization).....	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	-----	-----	-----
Oregon and California grant lands (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(16,945,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	(9,750,000)	-----	-----	-----
Range improvements (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(1,346,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	(1,448,000)	-----	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Land Management.....	55,725,000	53,655,000	53,655,000	54,032,000	53,887,000	+232,000	+232,000	—145,000



## EXHIBIT 1—Continued

## Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowancees			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued								
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT—Continued								
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS								
Education and welfare services.....	\$107,048,400	\$115,296,000	\$114,475,000	\$115,061,300	\$114,690,300	—\$605,700	+\$215,300	—\$371,000
Resources management.....	43,551,000	44,611,000	44,086,000	44,086,000	44,086,000	—525,000		
Construction.....	35,151,000	57,164,000	55,325,000	56,848,000	56,118,000	—1,046,000	+793,000	—730,000
Road construction (liquidation of contract authorization).....	17,445,000	16,754,000	16,754,000	16,889,000	16,889,000	+135,000	+135,000	
General administrative expenses.....	4,623,000	4,677,000	4,623,000	4,623,000	4,623,000	—54,000		
Menominee educational grants.....	44,000							
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds.....	207,862,400	238,502,000	235,263,000	237,507,300	236,406,300	—2,095,700	+1,143,300	—1,101,000
Tribal funds (not included in totals of this tabulation).....	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,000,000)			
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION								
Salaries and expenses.....	3,466,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,960,000	3,910,000			—50,000
Land and water conservation (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(125,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)	(110,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.....	3,466,000	3,910,000	3,910,000	3,960,000	3,910,000			—50,000
OFFICE OF TERRITORIES								
Administration of territories.....	17,079,000	10,513,000	10,513,000	10,513,000	10,513,000			
Trust territory of the Pacific Islands.....	17,446,600	17,494,000	17,494,000	17,494,000	17,494,000			
Limitation on administrative expenses, Virgin Islands Corporation.....	(100,000)							
Total, Office of Territories.....	34,525,600	28,007,000	28,007,000	28,007,000	28,007,000			
THE ALASKA RAILROAD								
Payment to the Alaska Railroad revolving fund.....	4,100,000							
Total, Public Land Management.....	305,679,000	324,074,000	320,835,000	323,506,300	322,210,300	—1,863,700	+1,375,300	—1,296,000
MINERAL RESOURCES								
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY								
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	73,190,870	80,520,000	72,782,000	80,932,000	80,032,000	—488,000	+7,250,000	—900,000
BUREAU OF MINES								
Conservation and development of mineral resources.....	32,391,000	35,166,000	31,540,000	34,940,000	34,740,000	—426,000	+3,200,000	—200,000
Health and safety.....	9,599,000	9,390,000	9,390,000	9,390,000	9,390,000			
Solid waste disposal.....	1,400,000	4,335,000	4,000,000	4,300,000	4,300,000	—35,000	+300,000	
Appalachian region mining area restoration.....		10,566,000	8,000,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	—3,566,000	—1,000,000	
General administrative expenses.....	1,551,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	1,556,000	1,556,000			
Helium Fund: Borrowing authorization.....	(16,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)	(26,000,000)			
Total, Bureau of Mines.....	44,941,000	61,013,000	54,486,000	57,186,000	56,986,000	—4,027,000	+2,500,000	—200,000
OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH								
Salaries and expenses.....	7,220,000	8,237,000	8,220,000	8,220,000	8,220,000	—17,000		
OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS								
Salaries and expenses.....	720,300	722,000	722,000	722,000	722,000			
Total, Mineral Resources.....	126,072,170	150,492,000	136,210,000	147,060,000	145,960,000	—4,532,000	+9,750,000	—1,100,000
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS								
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF FISH AND WILDLIFE								
Salaries and expenses.....	452,500							
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES								
Management and investigations of resources.....	27,072,800	20,092,000	20,312,000	21,076,000	20,701,000	+609,000	+389,000	+375,000
Management and investigations of resources (appropriation of receipts).....		(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)			
Management and investigations of resources (special foreign currency program).....	300,000	200,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	+300,000		
Construction.....	1,980,000	495,000	1,245,000	1,245,000	1,245,100	+750,000		
Construction of fishing vessels.....	5,000,000	3,300,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	—300,000		
Federal aid for commercial fisheries research and development.....	4,713,200	3,210,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	4,710,000	+1,500,000		
Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation.....				2,675,000	2,675,000	+2,675,000	+2,675,000	
General administrative expenses.....	689,000	739,000	739,000	739,000	739,000			
Administration of Pribilof Islands (indefinite appropriation of receipts).....	(2,464,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)	(2,468,000)			
Limitation on administrative expenses, Fisheries loan fund.....	(309,000)	(309,000)	(309,000)	(309,000)	(309,000)			
Total, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.....	34,755,000	28,036,000	30,506,000	33,945,000	33,570,000	+5,534,000	+3,064,000	—375,000



## EXHIBIT 1—Continued

## Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued								
FISH AND WILDLIFE AND PARKS—Continued								
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE								
Management and investigations of resources.....	\$36,792,300	\$37,304,000	\$37,164,000	\$39,161,400	\$38,145,800	+\$841,800	+\$981,800	-\$1,105,600
Construction.....	18,299,200	3,169,000	5,130,000	8,341,600	7,118,600	+3,949,600	+1,988,600	-1,223,000
Migratory bird conservation account.....	7,500,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000			
Appalachian region fish and wildlife restoration projects.....		1,350,000	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	-850,000	-500,000	
Anadromous and Great Lakes Fisheries Conservation.....				2,675,000	2,675,000	+2,675,000	+2,675,000	
General administrative expenses.....	1,492,300	1,564,000	1,549,000	1,564,000	1,549,000	-15,000		-15,000
Total, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.....	64,083,800	49,387,000	50,843,000	58,242,000	55,988,400	+6,601,400	+5,145,400	-2,253,600
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE								
Management and protection.....	33,394,000	36,177,000	35,694,000	36,171,600	35,932,800	-244,200	+238,800	-238,800
Maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities.....	25,487,000	27,022,000	26,680,000	26,680,000	26,680,000	-342,000		
Construction.....	27,883,000	23,500,000	22,894,000	23,494,000	22,894,000	-606,000		-600,000
Parkway and road construction (liquidation of contract authorization).....	38,500,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000			
General administrative expenses.....	2,522,000	2,562,100	2,562,000	2,562,000	2,562,000	-100		
Total, National Park Service.....	127,791,000	119,261,100	117,830,000	118,907,600	118,068,800	-1,192,300	+233,800	-833,800
Total, Fish, Wildlife, and Parks.....	227,082,300	196,684,100	199,179,000	211,094,600	207,627,200	+10,943,100	+8,448,200	-3,467,400
OFFICE OF SALINE WATER								
Salaries and expenses.....	20,000,000	28,595,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	27,500,000	-1,095,000		
Operation and maintenance.....	2,485,000	2,351,000	2,351,000	2,351,000	2,351,000			
Total, Office of Saline Water.....	22,485,000	30,946,000	29,851,000	29,851,000	29,851,000	-1,095,000		
OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH								
Salaries and expenses.....	6,396,000	6,894,000	6,894,000	6,894,000	6,894,000			
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR								
Salaries and expenses.....	4,596,800	4,704,000	4,650,000	4,704,000	4,704,000		+54,000	
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Salaries and expenses.....	4,557,200	5,186,000	4,984,100	5,051,700	4,998,900	-\$187,100	+14,800	-52,800
Total, direct appropriations.....	696,868,470	718,980,100	702,603,100	728,161,600	722,245,400	+3,265,300	+19,642,300	-5,916,200
Total, appropriation of receipts.....	145,755,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	124,666,000	124,666,000			
Total, borrowing authorization.....	16,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000			
Total, title I, Department of the Interior.....	858,623,470	869,646,100	853,269,100	878,827,600	872,911,400	+3,265,300	+19,642,300	-5,916,200
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES								
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE								
FOREST SERVICE								
Forest protection and utilization:								
Forest land management.....	171,953,000	172,856,000	172,821,000	174,521,000	173,850,000	+994,000	+1,029,000	-671,000
Forest research.....	37,374,000	34,435,000	34,955,000	38,578,000	37,821,000	+3,386,000	+2,866,000	-757,000
State and private forestry cooperation.....	17,558,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000	17,897,000			
Total, forest protection and utilization.....	226,885,000	225,188,000	225,673,000	230,996,000	229,568,000	+4,380,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
Forest roads and trails (liquidation of contract authorization).....	102,136,000	102,530,000	101,230,000	101,230,000	101,230,000	+1,300,000		
Timber development, organization loans and technical assistance.....		500,000				-500,000		
Acquisitions of lands for national forests:								
Uinta National Forest.....		300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000			
Special acts (appropriation of receipts).....	(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)			
Cooperative range improvements (appropriation of receipts).....	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)	(700,000)			
Assistance to States for tree planting.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000			
Total, definite appropriations.....	330,021,000	329,518,000	328,203,000	333,526,000	332,098,000	+2,580,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
Total, appropriation of receipts.....	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000			
Total, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.....	330,801,000	330,298,000	328,983,000	334,306,000	332,878,000	+2,580,000	+3,895,000	-1,428,000
FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW								
Salaries and expenses.....	91,000	61,400	61,400	61,400	61,400			
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS								
Salaries and expenses.....	123,000	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000			
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE								
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Indian health activities.....	67,548,000	73,448,000	73,250,000	73,671,000	73,671,000	+223,000	+421,000	
Construction of Indian health facilities.....	14,096,000	14,422,000	13,000,000	13,928,000	13,464,000	-958,000	+464,000	-464,000
Total, Public Health Service.....	81,644,000	87,870,000	86,250,000	87,599,000	87,135,000	-735,000	+885,000	

## EXHIBIT 1—Continued

## Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill, 1967 (H.R. 14215)—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1966	Budget estimates, 1967	Allowances			Conference allowance compared with—		
			House	Senate	Conference	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance
TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES—Con.								
DEPARTMENT OF HEW—Continued								
OFFICE OF EDUCATION								
Arts and humanities educational activities.....	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	-----	-----	-\$464,000
Total, Health, Education, and Welfare.....	82,644,000	88,870,000	87,250,000	88,599,000	88,135,000	\$-735,000	\$+885,000	-464,000
INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	347,000	438,000	382,000	382,000	382,000	-56,000	-----	-----
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	818,000	1,144,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	-139,000	-----	-----
Land acquisition, National Capital park, parkway, and playground system.....	-----	6,100,000	-----	-----	-----	-6,100,000	-----	-----
Total, National Capital Planning Commission.....	818,000	7,244,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	1,005,000	-6,239,000	-----	-----
NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY								
Salaries and expenses.....	425,000	1,575,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	-175,000	-----	-----
Construction, rail rapid transit system.....	3,679,000	17,055,000	9,055,000	9,055,000	9,055,000	-8,000,000	-----	-----
Total, National Capital Transportation Agency.....	4,104,000	18,630,000	10,455,000	10,455,000	10,455,000	-8,175,000	-----	-----
NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES								
Salaries and expenses.....	5,700,000	13,930,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-4,930,000	+2,000,000	-----
Endowment for the arts.....	2,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Endowment for the humanities.....	3,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.....	10,700,000	13,930,000	7,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000	-4,930,000	+2,000,000	-----
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS								
Salaries and expenses.....	50,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	750,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	907,000	-----	-----	-----
SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION								
Salaries and expenses.....	18,921,000	23,437,000	22,523,000	22,844,000	22,523,000	-914,000	-----	-321,000
Archeological research and excavation (special foreign currency program).....	1,300,000	5,700,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	-3,384,000	-----	-----
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	1,539,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	1,589,000	-----	-----	-----
Restoration and renovation of buildings.....	2,248,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	2,300,000	-----	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses, National Gallery of Art.....	2,531,000	2,765,000	2,694,000	2,718,000	2,718,000	-47,000	+24,000	-----
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	26,539,000	35,791,000	31,422,000	31,767,000	31,446,000	-4,345,000	+24,000	-321,000
CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	100,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	25,000	-10,000	-----	-10,000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION								
Construction, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial.....	1,400,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, Corregidor-Bataan Memorial.....	1,425,000	35,000	25,000	35,000	25,000	-10,000	-----	-10,000
LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION								
Salaries and expenses.....	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	-----	-----	-----
TRANSITIONAL GRANTS TO ALASKA								
Grants.....	5,376,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR ALASKA								
Salaries and expenses.....	174,000	190,000	190,000	190,000	190,000	-----	-----	-----
COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO								
Salaries and expenses.....	200,000	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
HISTORICAL AND MEMORIAL COMMISSION								
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	20,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, direct appropriations.....	463,507,000	495,834,400	467,120,400	476,147,400	473,924,400	-21,910,000	+6,804,000	-2,223,000
Total, appropriation of receipts.....	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	780,000	-----	-----	-----
Total, title II, related agencies.....	464,287,000	496,614,400	467,900,400	476,927,400	474,704,400	-21,910,000	+6,804,000	-2,223,000
Grand total.....	1,322,910,470	1,366,260,500	1,321,169,500	1,355,755,000	1,347,615,800	-18,644,700	+26,446,300	-8,139,200
Consisting of—								
Direct appropriations.....	1,160,375,470	1,214,814,500	1,169,723,500	1,204,309,000	1,196,169,800	-18,644,700	+26,446,300	-8,139,200
Appropriation of receipts.....	146,535,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	125,446,000	-----	-----	-----
Borrowing authorization.....	16,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	26,000,000	-----	-----	-----



Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, before conclusion of Senate consideration of the House-Senate conference committee approved appropriations bill for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the coming fiscal year, I believe it is appropriate to note for the RECORD two of the items included.

One concerns the program to protect endangered wildlife species, the other is the effort to prevent destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.

#### ENDANGERED SPECIES

Concerning endangered species of wildlife, included with this bill in the report is language authorizing the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to add six new positions to the program being undertaken by the Endangered Wildlife Research Station at the Patuxent Wildlife Center located not too far from our Capital City.

This language was submitted by me during our Senate appropriations subcommittee consideration of the Interior bill. As a matter of record, I might point out that the endangered wildlife facility at Patuxent, which is now under development, is the project which I recommended a year ago.

At that time I submitted a funding amendment to the Interior appropriations bill, asking that \$350,000 be allocated for establishing the endangered species center so as to expand the research efforts underway in the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

This recommendation received approval of the Senate Appropriations Committee and subsequently the Congress, and last fall work was started on locating the facility at Patuxent. This spring, I received a progress report on the endangered species program at Patuxent, which, I should point out, is under the direction of one of the outstanding biologists in this field in the country, Dr. Ray Erickson. Dr. Erickson brings to this vital research effort the knowledge and experience of many years of dedicated work in behalf of preserving our wildlife resources. I am confident that under the direction of this most able public servant, we are going to witness tremendous progress in the important tasks of saving from extinction such valuable birds and animals as the whooping crane, the black-footed ferret and many, many others.

Mr. President, I would like to include at this point in my remarks, the progress report on the endangered species program resulting from the utilization of funds which I had recommended.

There being no objection, the progress report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ENDANGERED SPECIES PROGRAM

The sum of \$350,000, appropriated by Congress last spring, has permitted the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to embark on an active research and propagation program for threatened American wildlife.

All captive wildlife stock formerly held at Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in southern Colorado was moved on February 21 to Patuxent Wildlife Research Center near Laurel, Maryland, where temporary pens and ponds had been built for their immediate occupancy. The stock included "Canus",

the young whooping crane which was rescued after being found injured in Wood Buffalo National Park nearly two years ago; 45 greater and lesser sandhill cranes; 8 Aleutian Canada geese, 3 tule white-fronted geese; 4 dusky grouse; and several dozen silky bantams used for incubation studies.

Also on hand are 8 South American snail kites which are being studied to develop rearing methods which might be used with the endangered Florida Everglade kites; 4 pairs of masked bobwhite quail as a result of my request to the Levy brothers, Seymour and James, of Tucson, Arizona, soon will be air-shipped to Patuxent for propagation purposes.

A staff of ten is assigned to this new program. Dr. R. C. Erickson, as Assistant Director of the Patuxent Wildlife Research Center, is the responsible biologist in charge. The field investigations phase was initiated with the assignment of Winston E. Banko to Honolulu on the study of endangered Hawaiian birds; Fred C. Sibley to Ojai, California, on the California condor; Donald K. Fortenberry to Rapid City, South Dakota, on the black-footed ferret; and Norman E. Holgersen to southern Florida to study the Florida Everglades kite and other southeastern threatened species.

Two previously authorized positions are being occupied by C. Eugene Knoder, who heads the propagation aspects of the program, and his assistant, Donald Frickie. A secretary and two animal keepers remain to be assigned, though temporary employees are meeting interim needs.

Engineering planning is now complete and bids will be accepted soon for construction of a propagation building, a service-equipment storage building, a well, storage reservoir, and water distribution system, and a series of enclosures and ponds. Preliminary plans are at hand for a laboratory building, whose construction is proposed for fiscal year 1968. Other major construction contemplated during the next five years includes a large complex of covered and open enclosures and ponds; two more propagation buildings for shore and wading birds and for such perching birds as eagles, condors, hawks, woodpeckers, and songbirds; a building containing environmental control chambers; 2 custodial residences; and a visitors center where live examples of many rare and endangered wildlife species will be on public display near Washington.

An eventual staff of approximately 60 is anticipated, about half of them being technical personnel. It is expected that when the program reaches full stride within eight or ten years studies at Patuxent will be in progress on at least 100 different species in captivity which may be annually producing more than 5,000 birds for release to the wild. At this time several smaller research substations may also be developed at existing refuges or other Federal properties to meet the needs of species of threatened wildlife which cannot be held at Patuxent because of climatic or other reasons.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the language I submitted for inclusion in the report for fiscal 1967, will now permit adding six new positions to the research program, and this will be accomplished within operating funds provided in the budget request.

The total authorized staff of the endangered species program now consists of 10 employees. The six new positions will be needed to carry forward the functions of the station, with two of the staff assignments directed to field studies of such species as the Tule white-fronted goose, the masked bobwhite, the Attwater's prairie chicken, and the red wolf.

Two of the positions are for animal

caretakers to provide care of the captive stock on a 24-hour-day, 7-day-week basis for much of each year. Another staff assignment is for a secretary and the remaining post is for an animal physiologist-nutritionist needed to give continuing attention to the dietary requirements and the formulation of foods, as well as to make continuing appraisals of the physical condition of the captive stock.

Mr. President, I have here one further example of not only the progress being made at the endangered species center but a demonstration of the wonderful cooperation which is being received around the country in the effort to save our wildlife.

Recently Seymour and James Levy, of Tucson, Ariz., donated to the center four pairs of the rare masked bobwhite birds. The Levy brothers conduct their own efforts to propagate this particular variety, and are representative of many Americans who are devoting their talents to this significant conservation effort to preserve and enhance the tremendous wildlife heritage given to this country.

Mr. President, I request permission to include at this point in the RECORD a news story concerning the Levy brothers' contribution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 15, 1966.

Arrival this week of eight masked bobwhite quail at the Patuxent National Wildlife Research Center near Washington marks another step forward in the program to save endangered species of wildlife.

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, announced today that four pairs of the rare variety of quail (*Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*) have been presented to the center by Seymour and James Levy of Tucson, Arizona.

MUNDT said the Levy brothers, who are conducting their own efforts to propagate masked bobwhites, donated the birds to the center's new endangered species program established at Patuxent through the South Dakota Senator's efforts last year.

MUNDT said the masked bobwhite are being housed in pens specially built for them. He said the eight quail will provide a breeding nucleus for the endangered species project in an effort to repopulate the former range in Arizona of this species.

He said until the early 1900's, masked bobwhites were found in the desert areas of central southern Arizona. Their former range extended through middle Sonora in Mexico to about 50 miles north of the U.S.-Mexico border, and from the Baboquivari Mountains east to the upper Santo Cruz Valley.

"Present distribution of the variety," MUNDT said, "is confined to Southern Sonora, with some reported northeast of Guaymas, Sonora."

MUNDT said there is no estimate on the number of masked bobwhite quail in the wild, but noted that only a few sets of eggs have been discovered in recent years.

The endangered species program at Patuxent is under direction of Dr. R. C. Erickson, assistant director of the Patuxent Center. Already on hand at the station is the captive wildlife stock formerly held at Monte Vista National Wildlife Refuge in southern Colorado.

Temporary pens and ponds were built at Patuxent to house the stock which included "Canus," the young whooping crane which was rescued after being injured in Wood Buffalo National Park, Canada, nearly two



years ago; 45 greater and lesser sandhill cranes to be used in research to develop techniques for successful propagation of the rare whooping crane; eight Aleutian Canada geese; three tule white-fronted geese, four dusky grouse; and several dozen silky bantams used for incubation studies.

Also on hand are several South American snail kites which are being studied to develop rearing methods which might be used with the endangered Florida Everglade kites.

#### METROPOLITAN OPERA AMENDMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in connection with the Metropolitan Opera House, the conference approved bill contains my amendment which prohibits the National Foundation of Arts and Humanities from making any grant or other payment which would be used directly or indirectly for destruction of the Met.

It should be made clear, Mr. President, that this amendment in itself cannot prevent the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House, if that is the desire of the owners.

However, it does accomplish the purpose of preventing any expenditure of Federal funds for such purpose, and secondly, in my opinion, through adoption, it expresses the sense of the Congress as being opposed to destruction of this world famous structure in New York City.

The inception of this amendment originated with Representative WILLIAM WIDNALL, of New Jersey, and he is deserving of great credit for the effort made here in behalf of preserving this fine structure in New York City.

Unfortunately, when he proposed it in the other body, it was stricken on a point of order. I then submitted it in our Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, which agreed to it, and it subsequently received approval of the conference committee and is now part of the bill considered today in the Senate.

What this amendment also does, is pointed out by Mr. WIDNALL in his remarks. He stated:

Many of our historic buildings and sites that are rich in tradition, history, and architecture and of great cultural and artistic value are threatened by the bulldozers and the wrecking balls. Already, some 6,000 of our heritage of 12,000 most historically significant buildings have been destroyed, by progress of a kind which takes no account of history or cultural and artistic values. The Metropolitan Opera House was almost a victim of this kind of shortsighted progress.

Mr. WIDNALL continues:

The amendment voted by this House today has had a major role in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, and it established a precedent of major significance. Certainly no Federal funds should be used to destroy our historic landmarks and our cultural monuments. Saving these is a mark of our maturity as a nation.

Mr. President, I could not agree more with Mr. WIDNALL's statement and I share his pleasure that the New York State Legislature has passed overwhelmingly a measure to save the Metropolitan Opera House.

This, of course, is where the final action must come to save this magnificent structure, in the State of New York and the city of New York.

However, it is my hope that through the action taken by the Congress in ap-

proval of this amendment, we have provided some direction and some encouragement to those who continue to carry on the fight.

Mr. President, for the purposes of the historical record of the effort to save the Met here in Congress, I request permission to include several items which are pertinent to the issue and which are in chronological order.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. WIDNALL, APRIL 5, 1966

In December 1962 Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall declared the Metropolitan Opera House eligible for registration as a national historic landmark, but the Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., opposed such registration, and the board of directors, including Roger L. Stevens and Anthony A. Bliss, has continued to press for the destruction of the historic Metropolitan Opera House.

Mayor John Lindsay, of New York City, is interested in saving the Metropolitan Opera House, as are many other well-known people including Artur Rubinstein, Isaac Stern, Leonard Bernstein, Dr. Howard Hanson, Laszlo Halasz, Leopold Stokowski, Martha Graham, Rebekah Harkness, Dr. Harold Taylor, and Phillip Langer of the Theater Guild.

My proposed amendment would simply require that, as a condition of the expenditure of the millions of dollars provided, by this appropriation bill for the National Endowment for the Arts, none of these funds would be used directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City at 39th Street and Broadway. The Metropolitan Opera House should be preserved and operated on a sound basis for the enjoyment and appreciation of generations yet to come. The Met's friends are legion, and will yet save this exceptional structure known as a landmark throughout the world.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1966]

MAYOR SUPPORTS SAVING OLD MET—AID SAYS LINDSAY SEEKS CONSTRUCTIVE PURPOSE FOR OPERA HOUSE—DEMOLITION SCHEDULED, BUT SEVERAL GROUPS HOPE THAT RAZING FOR OFFICES CAN BE PREVENTED

(By Theodore Strongin)

Woody Klein, Mayor Lindsay's press secretary, said yesterday the mayor believed that the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street "should be saved and used for some constructive purpose. He has one or two staff members working on it," Mr. Klein added.

The opera house, which was completed in 1883, is scheduled to be demolished to make way for an office building after the opera company moves out next month. In September the new Met at Lincoln Center will open.

The mayor is pleased with the efforts of various groups who are trying to save the old building, said Mr. Klein.

Among these are the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., a nonprofit group with headquarters in Mount Vernon; the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects, whose members will testify at a meeting of the city planning commission on March 30, and the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, which has asked the planning commission to institute condemnation proceedings so that the city acquires title to the Met property.

The architects' group believes that by easing certain zoning restrictions and granting special permits the builders of the planned office structure can be compensated for the

loss they would incur if the present auditorium is preserved.

These matters would have to be studied, the architects concede. So they will suggest at the planning commission meeting that an impartial feasibility study be made to investigate their suggestions and, maybe, find new ones.

Roy Anderson, head of the Save the Met Foundation, said that this organization was circulating petitions to be sent to Governor Rockefeller, asking him to "introduce, support, and pass New York State legislation to preserve the famous Metropolitan Opera House." Mr. Anderson also said that he had information that could lead to a rehearing of the Met case before the Landmarks Preservation Commission or to a contest of the Met's lease to the group of real estate investors who plan to erect the office building.

#### TURNED DOWN LAST YEAR

In December the Landmarks Preservation Commission declined to designate the opera house a landmark, which would have saved it. At that time, the New York chapter of the American Institute of Architects suggested preserving the auditorium and building the office building over it. The commission found the plan economically unfeasible.

#### TO TAKE POSSESSION MAY 8

The group that leased the old Met site is headed by Jack D. Weiler and Irwin S. Chaimin of New York. It will take possession on May 8. The Met expects to get an average of \$485,000 a year in rentals.

A provision in the lease forbids the use of the site for grand opera or musical presentations. Anthony Bliss, president of the Met, said that the limiting provision was made for financial reasons only, so that the new building would produce the greatest revenue possible for the Met.

He said that many feasibility studies had been made over the years, and that the Met itself had investigated the possibility of building over the present house, but that all plans had proved to be financially unsound.

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, today advised the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York that he will propose an amendment to an appropriations bill "to help prevent the destruction of the world famous opera house".

MUNDT, ranking Republican on the Senate Appropriations subcommittee which considers funding for the Department of the Interior, said his amendment would be in the form of a prohibition against expenditure of Federal funds in the Interior bill which could be used "directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House".

The South Dakota Senator sent word of his action by telegram to Mr. Leonard Altman, Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, 33 East 61st Street, New York.

Text of MUNDT's telegram follows:

"It is with pleasure that I notify you that I will offer an amendment to the Interior Department and related agencies appropriation bill to help prevent the destruction of the world famous Metropolitan Opera House.

"At the earliest possible convenience I intend to propose an amendment that would prohibit the expenditure of any of the funds of that bill which would be used directly or indirectly to destroy the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City at 39th Street and Broadway.

"Your fight to preserve this symbol of our national heritage has inspired the entire Nation. It has pointed out that in spite of the emphasis on the promotion and advancement of our cultural heritage we have a tendency to betray the very cause which we honor if we do not look to the past as well as the future.



"In its eight decades of existence, the Met has brought countless hours of joy to millions in every State of the Union. Its preservation means as much to those who have never had the opportunity to hear in person the thrilling performances presented there, but have listened to its Saturday afternoon broadcasts, as those who were fortunate enough to attend in person.

"I know that the fans of the Metropolitan Opera are legion and will welcome this opportunity to save this symbol of America's highest artistic achievement. In a similar vein, I do not believe this is or should be a political issue. Both parties are equally in favor of the preservation and promotion of our cultural life and I therefore will invite Senators on both sides of the aisle to join with me in this battle so we may hopefully echo the words of Radames in Act I, Scene I of Aida:

"Per te ho pugnato, per te ho vinto!

"For you I fought, for you I conquered!

"KARL E. MUNDT,  
"U.S. Senator."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1966]  
\$8 MILLION IS GOAL TO SAVE OLD MET—CITY WOULD HAVE TO CONDEMN PROPERTY—MAY 10 DEADLINE

(By Dan Sullivan)

A last-minute campaign to raise \$8-million to save the old Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street was announced yesterday.

Leonard Altman, executive chairman of the recently formed Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, said his committee had exactly 34 days to raise the money. The opera house is scheduled to be razed for an office building any time after May 10.

The \$8-million would be enough to purchase the building, Mr. Altman said, but another fund-raising campaign would be necessary to renovate its interior.

The campaign was announced at a press conference at the Overseas Press Club. Among the speakers were Marian Anderson, Isaac Stern, Agnes De Mille, Tony Randall and Leopold Stokowski, national chairman of the campaign.

#### PUBLIC APPEAL PLANNED

All echoed Miss Anderson's statement that tearing down the old opera house would be "a tragedy."

Details of the fund-raising plan, as announced by Mr. Altman, were vague. He said that private individuals of means would be approached, that foundation help would be sought and that public appeals would be made through advertisements.

The committee proposes to purchase the opera house from the city, provided that the money can be raised and that the city agrees to condemn the property.

After purchase of the building, a non-profit corporation would operate it, renting the house to various attractions like ballet companies and orchestras. Mr. Altman said the committee already could guarantee 31 weeks of engagements at the house next season, none of them performances of opera.

He identified one of them as the American Ballet Theater, which wants to put on two four-week seasons at the old Met. He declined to name the others. "They are afraid of getting in trouble with other concert halls if our plan doesn't go through," he said.

#### NO LOSS FOR OPERA SEEN

The \$8-million, Mr. Altman said, will guarantee the Metropolitan Opera Association as much money from the sale of the property as it would receive from the long-term leasing program under which the office building is to be constructed.

The group that is planning to put up the office building will receive "fair compensa-

tion" for the money they have spent on the project, Mr. Altman said. Jack Weler and Irwin S. Chainin of New York head that group.

Whether condemnation proceedings will be initiated "rests primarily with Mayor Lindsay," Mr. Altman said. The Mayor knows about the committee's plans and seems "friendly" he said, but no promisee have been made. Mayor Lindsay's office had no comment on the matter last night.

#### DISAGREEMENT ON FIGURES

Anthony Bliss, president of the opera association, had several comments on Mr. Altman's plan. He said that the building would have to be sold for at least \$12 million—not \$8 million—to net as much money as the Met would receive over the next 50 years from leasing the property.

He added that he doubted there were enough attractions to fill both the old Met and the new Met, which opens at Lincoln Center in September and will be available for touring attractions during the spring and summer.

Management has not always been able to keep even the old house busy when the regular company has not been appearing there, Mr. Bliss said.

Most of the speakers at Mr. Altman's press conference were convinced that the old Met would be busy all year. Mr. Stokowski said that with the population growth of Greater New York, the central city would be called upon to increase its cultural facilities.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 11, 1966]  
CITIZENS' COMMITTEE FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE METROPOLITAN OPERA HOUSE

(Leonard Altman, Executive Chairman; Bronson Binger, Secretary; Coudert Bros., General Counsel, 33 East 61st Street, New York 10022, TE 2-8621.)

["From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 7, 1966]

"NATIONAL SAVE-THE-MET GOAL—RAISING \$8 MILLION IN 34 DAYS

("By William Bender)

"Four greats in the music and dance world launched a nationwide drive yesterday to raise \$8 million in 34 days to save the old Metropolitan Opera House from demolition.

"The four were Leopold Stokowski, Agnes De Mille, Isaac Stern, and Marian Anderson, acting as spokesmen for the three-week-old Citizens' Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House. Maestro Stokowski assumed the post of national chairman.

"The Committee wants to keep the old building in operation under a non-profit arrangement with New York City similar to that under which Carnegie Hall now is maintained."

Leopold Stokowski, National Chairman: "The Metropolitan Opera House is one of the finest and most famous in the world. All difficulties should be overcome so that this historic monument of American Culture can continue to be available to the public. . . ."

Isaac Stern: "I feel that this Hall could operate for 40 weeks a year to add most necessarily to the greatness of the cultural activity of New York and the United States, with absolutely no detriment or competition whatsoever to the new auditoriums now being completed. I am sure it will prove its value as a home for many groups searching desperately for a major theatre in which to perform, and also excite new ideas and new productions so necessary to the continuous development of our cultural life."

Senator KARL E. MUNDT: "I know that the fans of the Metropolitan are legion and will welcome the opportunity to save this symbol of America's highest artistic achievement. . . ."

Agnes de Mille: ". . . the building has a

mysterious combination of qualities that makes great theatre possible."

Marian Anderson: "It would be a tragedy to tear down this house."

Vladimir Horowitz: "To destroy the Met would be an act of barbarism."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 15, 1966]

FAREWELL FOR A GRAND OLD MET WILL OPEN A NEW ERA IN CITY'S OPERATIC HISTORY—8 P.M. TOMORROW. FINALE AT 39TH ST.—COMPANY TO PRESENT ALMOST 60 LEADING SINGERS IN BENEFIT PERFORMANCE

(By Theodore Strongin)

With a fine sense of history, the Metropolitan Opera will end 83 years in its home at Broadway and 39th Street tomorrow night with the closing scene from Gounod's "Faust."

It was "Faust, on Oct. 22, 1883, which opened the house before an audience sparkling with Goelets, Goulds, Iselins, Morgans, Rhinelanders, Vanderbilts, Warrens and other wealthy families whose demands for more and more box space had led to the construction of the building and the establishment of the company.

Many of their descendants, as well as about 40 former Met singers, will be in the audience at the Gala Farewell, a soldout benefit for the company with ticket prices as high as \$200. The performance begins at 8.

Nearly 60 of the Met's leading artists will sing parts of 25 operas, donating their services.

Plans to broadcast the performance have failed. Radio station WNYC had received the green light from both the Met and the American Federation of Musicians' Local 802 to make the broadcast, but the American Guild of Musical Artists "regretfully" declined to give permission. It gave no reason.

#### LABOR PROBLEMS UNRESOLVED

Probably only a few in the audience tomorrow night will be concerned with a grim undercurrent behind the scenes: Unresolved labor negotiations may jeopardize the opening of the company's Lincoln Center home on Sept. 16. There is also annoyance on the part of the Met's management at wide efforts to save the old house. The management has already signed a profitable agreement disposing of it.

Next week the company starts on its annual tour. The final stages of the move to Lincoln Center will be carried out during the Bolshoi Ballet's run at the old Met from next Tuesday through May 9, when the famous gold curtain will fall for the last time.

The Met intends to open its new house in September with the world premiere of Samuel Barber's "Antony and Cleopatra." A banner opening week is planned, with new productions of Ponchielli's "La Gioconda," Verdi's "La Traviata" and Strauss's "Die Frau Ohne Schatten."

Whether it will open as planned could depend on the outcome of the two-year-old negotiations between the Met and the members of its orchestra. The musicians have been working without a contract since June 30, 1964.

#### TALKS ARE "DRAGGING"

Neither side will say that agreement is in sight. "The negotiations are dragging," said one observer. The latest impasse reportedly concerns retroactivity.

The musicians want the new contract to put them, financially, where they would have been had agreement been reached at the expiration of the last contract. The management is said to have offered a flat sum of \$1,000 to cover the two years and a three-year contract with a minimum weekly pay of \$200 the first year rising to \$220 in the third. The minimum in the old contract was \$190.



The old Met will be officially taken over by Keystone Associates, a group of real-estate operators, on May 10. They have leased the site from the Met for 50 years. The building is to be razed and replaced with a 40-story office structure. Several groups and individuals are now campaigning to save the house (or at least the auditorium) both because of its historic value and because of its usefulness as a hall for the performing arts.

Among the principal backers of the drive are the Save the Met Foundation, the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street and the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

#### \$8 MILLION DRIVE UNDERWAY

The Citizens Committee, formed last month, is trying to raise \$8-million by May 10 to buy the building. It would renovate it (for \$14-million more) and operate it as a music and dance theater.

The architect's chapter proposes that Keystone Associates build its offices over the present auditorium, saving the "Golden Horseshoe" of boxes and balconies and the gold-decorated interior.

Mayor Lindsay has said that he would be interested in saving the building if "some constructive purpose" could be found for it.

At Lincoln Center, the Met will move into a \$45.7-million structure that is now 95 percent complete. The modern backstage facilities, rehearsal rooms, dressing rooms, lobby space are such as to make the company members' mouth water. The 39th Street house had been criticized as inadequate almost since it was built.

The new Met, which will seat 3,800—175 more than the old house—is like a 47-story skyscraper laid on its side. More than half of its cubic footage is behind the proscenium, where most of a season's scenery can be stored. The old Met allowed the storage of only 20 per cent of a season's scenery.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 22, 1966]  
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES—MET  
MUSICAL LANDMARK

To the Editor:

The salvation of the Metropolitan Opera House has sparked the imaginations of Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL of New Jersey and Senator KARL E. MUNDT of South Dakota.

The fact that efforts to save the Met are being made in Washington only point up the fact that the Opera House is more than a New York landmark. It is a musical landmark, of great significance throughout the world, and should be preserved in the interests of art and history for the benefit of all people.

JANET GOLLER.

FOREST HILLS, LONG ISLAND,  
April 18, 1966.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1966]  
SAVE-THE-MET COMMITTEE IS TOLD ITS GOAL  
IS \$7 MILLION TOO LOW  
(By Theodore Strongin)

At least \$15 million would be needed to save the old Metropolitan Opera House, Anthony Bliss, Met president, has told a citizens committee now working to raise \$8 million to save the building.

It was learned yesterday that Mayor Lindsay does not plan to intervene in the campaign to save the house. He will leave its fate to the private individuals concerned.

Mr. Bliss met on Monday with the committee's counsel at the request of the Mayor, to discuss finances.

The opera company opens in its new home at Lincoln Center on Sept. 16. It has already leased the site of its old house at Broadway and 39th Street to Keystone Associates, a group of real estate investors who will take over May 10. Keystone plans to demolish the building and replace it with a 40-story office building.

#### \$8 MILLION GOAL PROPOSED

The Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House estimates that the \$8-million it is trying to get, would, if invested, return the Met as much money as it will get from the lease to Keystone.

"The \$8-million doesn't even begin to do the job," Mr. Bliss said yesterday.

Under the terms of the lease, the Met will receive \$24.2-million over the next 50 years, the committee asserts. It says that "a prudent investment" of the \$8-million would yield to the Met more than the \$24.2-million.

Mr. Bliss called the committee's figures "ridiculous." The committee, he said, did not count the returns from investing the lease income, and disregarded certain rights the Met will have in the new office building.

Mr. Bliss will hold no more meetings, he said yesterday, until the committee can approach him with sufficient cash pledges of cash to make the possibility of saving the old building a reality. Such an approach would make "research by our bankers really worth our while," he said, commenting on the approximate nature of the \$15-million figure.

#### PLANNING COSTS SUBSTANTIAL

Beyond the Met's needs, Mr. Bliss said, Keystone Associates would have to be reimbursed for the planning work done on the project office building, since the lease was signed five years ago. Irwin Chanin, representing Keystone, would not estimate that amount yesterday. An informed source placed it at somewhere near \$3-million. Thus, according to Mr. Bliss, the Citizens Committee would have to raise \$18-million by May 10 to save the old house and its famous "Diamond Horseshoe" of boxes and balconies.

The committee has received \$500 from the Independent Concert Managers Association, representing the major New York management firms, and \$250 from the Theater Guild.

It has also received \$8,000 from the Avon Foundation, a St. Paul group. The \$8,000 contingent upon the committee's raising the balance of what it needs.

The committee had been urging the mayor to start proceedings towards condemnation of the house. Commenting up the Mayor's plans not to intervene a representative of the committee said yesterday that it had a new approach, but declined to identify it. Leopold Stokowski is national chairman of the committee. Leonard Altman is its executive chairman.

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1966]  
APPEAL BY WAGNER MADE FOR OLD MET

Former Mayor Robert F. Wagner issued a statement yesterday afternoon supporting the Citizen's Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House. Mr. Wagner said:

"The preservation of Carnegie Hall—one of the proud achievements of the Wagner administration—has proved to be a major boon to the expansion of our cultural life. At this time, with the future of the old Metropolitan Opera House hanging in the balance, should like to state that I feel it to be in the best interest of the people of our city and nation that this great and historic building also be saved.

"Time is short. The land has been leased to real-estate developers, who take over on May 10. But, there is now pending in Albany a bill which provides for a six months delay in demolition, indemnifies the land owners and lease holders for the delay, and provides for condemnation proceedings to insure a fair price for all parties concerned. Public funds will not be involved. I urge the prompt passage of this bill and its immediate signing by the Governor."

Also yesterday, Benjamin M. Zelman, a lawyer for the Save the Met Foundation, Inc., urged the Landmarks Preservation

Commission to act for the old Met. Discussing the matter with the commission at 2 Lafayette Street, he said that local law gives it authority over works of art as well as structures. Mr. Zelman argued that the old Met is a work of art, and called for the commission to schedule an immediate hearing of arguments in the case. No immediate action was taken.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,  
May 9, 1966]

#### D.C. GROUP SEEKS TO SAVE THE MET

An emergency appeal on behalf of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City is being made by a group of prominent Washingtonians.

In a message to the directors of the Metropolitan Opera Association and the real estate syndicate of Keystone Associates, the Washingtonians have asked that demolition, scheduled to start tomorrow, be delayed a month.

The organization, Washington Friends of the Metropolitan Opera House, suggests the "possibility of building over and around part of the existing structure. . . ."

Among the listed as signers are Senators PAUL DOUGLAS and ERNEST GRUENING and S. Dillon Ripley of the Smithsonian Institution, according to Sylvia Altman, a coordinator of the group.

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1966]  
SIX MORE MONTHS SOUGHT FOR MET—DRIVE TO  
SAVE OPERA HOUSE FOCUSES ON LEGISLATURE  
(By Theodore Strongin)

Efforts to save the old Metropolitan Opera House, which at last stands empty, are aimed at delaying its demolition for six months until money can be raised to buy it.

The Metropolitan Opera Company has almost completed moving to its new home in Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. The final scheduled performance in the old house was given last night by the Bolshoi Ballet while pickets urging the building's preservation marched outside.

Keystone Associates, a group of real estate developers, has leased the site of the old Met; it plans to raze the opera house and put up a 40-story office building. Keystone is expected to take over the old building tomorrow. The exact date for the wrecking ball to swing into action is not known; as of late last week, no demolition permit has been granted by the city Building Department.

The Save the Met Foundation, Inc., and the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House at Broadway and 39th Street, among other groups, have been urging that proceedings be started to rescue the building. The Citizens Committee proposes to buy it, renovate it and run it as a theater for the performing arts. The group claims it could fill the house with attractions for 31 weeks next season.

#### DISAGREEMENT ON FIGURE

Under the leadership of Leopold Stokowski, national chairman, and Leonard Altman, executive chairman, the Citizens Committee has been holding a last-minute fund drive to raise the \$8-million it says would be needed to buy the opera house and reimburse the Met company for the money it is to receive under the lease with Keystone. The Met disputes this figure; it says the purchase price would probably have to be \$15-million.

Bronson Binger, secretary of the Citizens Committee, declined to say yesterday how much the fund drive had raised, but indications are that it is small. Mr. Binger explained that efforts lately had been devoted to gaining a demolition delay through the Legislature rather than to raising money.

Mayor Lindsay has declined to begin condemnation proceedings to prevent demolition. But Mr. Binger said an 11th-hour State Senate bill to save the old Met would



be reported to the floor tomorrow by the Rules Committee. The bill would set up a nonprofit corporation; demolition would be delayed for six months if the corporation posted a bond to indemnify both the Met company and Keystone for the delay. This would give the Citizens Committee six months to raise the purchase money, Mr. Binger said.

#### APPEAL FROM WASHINGTON

Yesterday a group of prominent Washingtonians urged a delay in demolition. Their appeal, addressed to the Met company and to Keystone, asked for "a reprieve" of one month to allow "time for further consideration of other alternatives."

Among the signers of the appeal were Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS of Illinois; Senator ERNEST GRUENING of Alaska; Dr. S. Dillen Ripley, head of the Smithsonian Institution; Drew Pearson, the columnist, and Sylvia Altman, chairman of the cultural affairs committee of the Greater Washington Central Labor Council.

In New York, the Council of Actors Equity came out yesterday in support of "the salvation and restoration of this great and historical landmark."

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1966]  
STATE SENATORS ACT TO SAVE MET—ADOPT BILL, 61 TO 2—TRAVIA ASKS CHANGE IN ASSEMBLY

(By Sydney H. Schanberg)

ALBANY, May 10.—By a vote of 61 to 2, the Senate today approved a plan designed to save the historic Metropolitan Opera House "before the wrecking ball starts swinging."

The Assembly leader, Speaker Anthony J. Travia, has introduced a different bill to save the Met. But he indicated after the Senate vote late this afternoon that he was amenable to compromise and might accept the Senate bill if it were amended slightly.

As a result, it appeared likely that final action would be taken by the Legislature shortly, perhaps next week.

The Senate bill was championed by Whitney North Seymour, Jr., Manhattan Republican. He said "no one has any illusions that it will be easy" to raise the money to buy the Met. But, he declared, "It is a cultural landmark that, once lost, will be lost forever."

Senator Jerome L. Wilson, Manhattan Democrat, said, "No other culture in the Western world would even consider destroying such a structure as this."

The two lone votes against the bill were cast by Senators Harrison J. Goldin and Archie A. Gorfinkel, both Democrats from the Bronx.

#### HOW PLAN WOULD WORK

Under the bill—which would go into effect immediately after being signed by Governor—a nonprofit corporation would be created, known as The Old Met Opera House Corporation.

The new corporation would have the power to acquire the opera house site at Broadway and 39th Street by condemnation and then renovate and restore the building for the "public purpose" of operating it as a "facility for the performing arts with special emphasis on music."

Probably the bill's most crucial point is that it would give the new corporation an opportunity to block any demolition for six months. The measure provides that if the present lessee, Keystone Associates, files for a demolition permit from the city Buildings Department, the Buildings Commissioner could hold up the permit for 180 days if the new Met corporation deposits \$100,000 as security with the county clerk of Manhattan.

If, in that time, the corporation fails to raise enough money to buy the opera house, Keystone would be able to go ahead with its plans to raze the structure and erect a 40-story office building in its place.

#### PURPOSE OF THE DEPOSIT

Whether the new corporation fails or succeeds in raising the money, owners of the site—the Metropolitan Opera Company, which is moving to the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts—would be compensated from the \$100,000 security for any losses it suffered because of the delay in demolition.

The Senate bill was prepared by the Citizens Committee for the preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, headed by Leopold Stokowski. Reportedly drafted with the help of the New York City corporation counsel, the bill was introduced by Senator Seymour and Senator John J. Marchi, Staten Island Republican.

The Travia bill in the Assembly was proposed by the Save the Met Foundation, Inc.—another citizens' group formed to stave off demolition. This measure would authorize the City of New York to buy the opera house and lease it to the Save the Met Foundation. If necessary, the city could sell bonds to buy the building.

What Speaker Travia objects to in particular in the Senate bill is a provision that would permit an office building to be built atop the opera house as a revenue producer.

"I'm for saving the Met, not building an office building," said Mr. Travia, a Brooklyn Democrat. "I'm amenable to compromise, but not with that clause in there."

#### MOERDLER MAKES REQUEST

Buildings Commissioner Charles G. Moerdler requested the police yesterday to take "vigorous steps" to prevent demolition of the old Metropolitan Opera House because no wrecking permit had been requested or issued.

Under a lease signed in February, 1961, the Metropolitan Opera turned over possession of the building yesterday to Keystone Associates, a group of real estate developers. Keystone plans to tear the opera house down and replace it with an office building. The Met moved the last of its effects yesterday to its new home in Lincoln Center.

Mr. Moerdler said he had received several reports yesterday that parts of the interior of the old Met were being torn down. Richard Caine Striker, a member of the Citizens Committee to Save the Old Metropolitan Opera House, said that on Monday he found workmen unscrewing some of the decorative brass pillars between boxes of the diamond horseshoe. Later he ascertained that the pillars would be sold by the opera company as souvenirs. The Met told him that it could provide the names of the buyers, Mr. Striker said, should legislation saving the house be passed.

MAY 12, 1966.

#### METROPOLITAN OPERA AMENDMENT PASSES SENATE

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, today expressed hope his amendment concerning the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City "would encounter no difficulties in the House-Senate conference committee when it considers the Department of Interior Appropriations Bill as passed by the House and the Senate."

MUNDT's amendment, added to the fiscal 1967 appropriations bill by the Senate Appropriations Committee at his request, would prevent the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities from making any grant or other payment which would be used directly or indirectly for destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House.

The amendment was included as part of the related agencies portion of the Interior bill which was approved by the Senate today.

MUNDT said through inclusion of the amend in the bill, he considers the Senate action as "an expression of protest against destruction of the Opera House."

The South Dakota Senator, who will serve as ranking Republican of the Senate Appro-

priations Committee at the House-Senate conference, said it is his understanding progress is being made in the New York State Legislature to prevent destruction of the Met.

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1966]  
LESSEES GET SET TO RAZE MET; SENATE REWRITES A RESCUE BILL  
(By Theodore Strongin)

The city Department of Buildings has granted a permit to the leaseholders of the site of the old Metropolitan Opera House to build a construction shed on the property preparatory to obtaining a demolition permit.

The leaseholders—the firm of Swig, Weiler & Arnov, in association with Irwin Chanin, operating as Keystone Associates—plan to replace the old opera house with a 40-story office building.

In Albany yesterday, the Senate passed an amended version of a bill designed to preserve the structure. The amendments were reported to have been introduced to satisfy the objections of Assembly Speaker Anthony J. Travia to the original Senate measure passed last week.

The Assembly passed the measure last night, and it now goes to Governor Rockefeller for signature.

Under the bill as it stands now a nonprofit corporation would be created, known as the Old Met Opera House Corporation. The new corporation would have the power to acquire the site of the opera house at Broadway and 39th Street by condemnation. It would renovate the building for the "public purpose" of operating it as a performing arts theater.

#### BOND MUST BE POSTED

The bill provides for delaying demolition of the old house up to 180 days, provided the corporation posts a bond of \$200,000. The amount was \$100,000 in the version originally passed. Purpose of the delay would be to allow the corporation to raise the purchase price of the site and building.

The Metropolitan Opera Company is strongly opposed to the bill. The company stands to receive nearly \$25-million from its 50-year lease to Keystone at an average of \$484,000 a year. Company officials declare that the bill would put this money in jeopardy. The 180-day stay in demolition would give Keystone an opportunity to disaffirm the lease, say the officials, since the lease's terms would be frustrated by the bill. If the committee failed to raise the necessary purchase money, the company, say the officials, could be left with the old house on its hands and no money.

The company is counting on the lease money in planning its activities in its new Lincoln Center home, where it opens next Sept. 16. The company also takes exception to the name "Old Met Opera House Corporation," since it considers that the word "Met" belongs to itself.

#### COMMITTEE SEEKS \$8 MILLION

The Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House, a private group, is believed to have helped write the bill. The committee has been raising money to save the old house. It is aiming at \$8-million, which it considers an amount that, prudently invested, would more than reimburse the Met for the loss of lease money. Met officials say that a fair price would be \$12-million to \$15-million.

Rudolf Bing, general manager of the Met Company, in a speech yesterday accepting the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters from New York University, warned that "certain groups are trying to save an old building and may well succeed, in the process, in killing the company that made the building what it was."

"Politicians who have never darkened the door of the Metropolitan Opera are suddenly



throwing around hollow phrases about saving culture, blissfully unaware that they may be about to destroy it."

Mr. Chanin attacked the Senate bill as unconstitutional in that it would give the power of eminent domain "into the hands of a few private citizens who obviously do not have the funds to pay for the rights" of the involved parties.

A representative of the citizens committee has replied that the money is available to enable condemnation proceedings to start within two weeks, if the bill becomes law.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1966]

#### COUNCILMAN ASSAILS OPERA ASSOCIATION

City Councilman Woodward Kingman yesterday said he was "shocked by the [Metropolitan Opera] Association's claim that the sum of \$15-million is the (old Met's) true value.

Mr. Kingman, an officer of the First National City Bank, said the old Met land is taxed on the basis of a total assessed valuation of \$4.75 million.

"It would seem to me both in my capacity as a banker and as a councilman," he added, "that more careful consideration should be given to the claims of the Citizen's Committee that the Metropolitan Operation Association will gain, not lose, by selling its land at a fair price rather than by renting it to Keystone Associates."

Mr. Kingman was referring to the Citizens Committee for the Preservation of the Metropolitan Opera House. The committee asserts that \$8-million is a fair price for the old Met, and that \$8-million, prudently invested, would return more than the 50-year lease the Met has given Keystone, which calls for an annual average rental of \$484,000.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the conference report be agreed to.

The conference report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 14215, which was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 14215) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes."

*Resolved*, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed, insert the following: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$468,000 shall be for assistance to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school".

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the conference report was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### PROPOSALS TO TURN OVER TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS U.S. FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, when I recently left the Foreign Relations Committee to accept assignment on the Commerce Committee, I did not cease to be interested in the vital national interests which are involved in foreign affairs.

I rise today for the purpose of expressing my opinion on one of the issues which is before the Foreign Relations Committee at the present time. It has been proposed within the committee that our foreign aid programs be turned over to agencies of an international character; that we provide the funds for others to spend in the developing nations of the world.

I am opposed to this suggestion, Mr. President. Although I have often been critical of the foreign aid programs, and have voted against them all on a number of occasions, I have never proposed that they be abolished. My opposition has been directed at what I considered, and still consider, to be the waste and inefficiency with which they have often been administered. There should be foreign aid programs, and considerable sums should be spent in financing them. This is desirable to provide support for the national objectives of the United States in overseas areas.

I do not agree that the United Nations and the many other international organizations which we already support financially can, or would, administer their programs to accomplish our national objectives—regardless of the amount of money we might contribute. In my opinion, we have always contributed more than we should to these organizations, and I believe that we are still doing so at the present time. We should be giving them less, rather than thinking of giving them more.

I have heard it argued many times, and so have all of you, that the very high proportion of the budget which the United States is contributing is not only unfair to the taxpayers of the United States, but undesirable from the point of view of the agencies themselves. I know that the Department of State, and even the President himself, has attempted and is continuing to attempt to increase the contributions of other members, and to reduce ours, at least proportionally. Some progress has been made in that direction, but the effort would not be assisted by a sudden decision on our part that we were going to toss more money into the pot, willy-nilly.

Yet, this is precisely what we would be required to do, under the proposal. We would, or I at least hope that we would, ask for a greater voice in the operation of the agencies. Let us suppose that we were granted a greater voice. Would this not mean that the same criticisms made of our unilateral programs—namely, that they are serving our purposes—would not then be made against the programs of the international agencies? How then would the situation have been improved?

On the other hand, let us suppose that we were denied a greater voice, and thus truly put into the role of Santa Clauses, who just hands out the dough in accordance with somebody else's Christmas list. Would Senators accept such a situation? I, for one, would not, and I do not believe any considerable number of this body would do so either.

It is not just the money alone which would cause the problems of a U.S. or a non-U.S. label on these programs. Increasingly, our own programs are concentrating on the basic fields of health, education, and agriculture, and I am entirely in accord with this emphasis. With much more money to spend, where would these agencies get the specialist and technician personnel to operate the expanded programs?

I am told that, in the numbers which would be required, they can be found only in the United States. What would then be the reaction in the developing countries to being told that the program was not a U.S. program any more—it was just U.S. money being spent by an international organization operated by U.S. personnel? I think we all know the answer to that one.

We would have sold ourselves down the river. We would still have the name, but we would no longer have the game; we would still pick up the check, but we could not select from the menu. We would have to be content with the pot luck—that the international kitchen dished out to us insofar as the results of these programs would be concerned.

There are some other points deserve consideration as well. One of the most important of these is the effect on our balance of payments—a problem which the President has often put very near the top of the list of our crucial problems. Very strong efforts have been made recently in the operation of our foreign aid programs to help to stop the drain of our reserves because of the highly unfavorable outflows which have been going on for a number of years.

In fiscal year 1961, only 41 percent of the economic aid funds were spent in the United States, compared with the 88 percent which is estimated for fiscal year 1967. AID reduced its net expenditures abroad from \$947 million in fiscal year 1961 to \$253 million in fiscal year 1965. During this same time, AID assisted directly in boosting U.S. exports through direct financing and other methods.

These actions have been taken specifically at the direction of the Congress. I am certain that all Senators know that international agencies would not take steps to continue these vitally important policies, and I do not believe that they are prepared to toss them aside.

With the expansion of our exports and direct assistance to our balance of payments would go also the emphasis on private enterprise which the Congress has insisted upon. We can be certain that the international agencies are not going to push our economic principles; their Communist and neutralist members will see to that. For myself, I consider this to be one of the most vital issues of all, because I believe that only if the free



enterprise system becomes the basis of the economic life of these developing nations will they ever achieve the desires of their people for a better standard of living and the personal freedom on which human happiness is based.

Included with the baby in the tub which we would throw out would be also our desire that the foreign assistance programs be administered with emphasis on self-help. Again, the Congress has given its stamp of approval to this policy, but it has only recently been applied. Its application would surely not be accepted by the international agencies.

I shall mention only one more element which I believe the Congress would regret to lose, before concluding my remarks, with comments on the more general considerations involved in the proposal. So long as the programs are administered by an agency of the U.S. Government, the Congress will have available to it the services of its watchdog, the Comptroller General of the United States. The President has recently appointed to that position a man of rare talents and experiences in all aspects of our national life.

I am certain that during his tenure of office he will do much to find, investigate, and report to the Congress those wastes and extravagances in the foreign aid programs which are, I think, the principal cause of their relative ineffectiveness in the past. We shall not have that assistance, Mr. President, if we turn these responsibilities over to the tender mercies of the international civil servants. Our representatives might have some hope of at least getting a discussion of some of the other policies which I have mentioned; we all know they would never dare to even suggest that Mr. Staats be permitted to audit the books.

Mr. President, one reason advanced for the proposal for multinational control of American expenditures is the assertion that our foreign aid programs have gotten us into armed conflict, and will get us into others. Specifically, statements have been made that our aid programs are responsible for our getting involved in the Vietnam war. If this assertion were indeed true, we should have to disregard the other disadvantages his proposals would have, and give most serious consideration to adopting them.

Fortunately, the assertion is no more than that, Mr. President, I can find no evidence to support this view, and, most assuredly, not so far as Vietnam is concerned. We are in Vietnam because of what would happen to the people of the area, and to the U.S. interests everywhere, if the Communists took southeast Asia. It was because of these interests that we started an aid program, and it was because the aid program did not prove to be enough that we have had to do more.

We did not send troops to Vietnam to save the aid program; we sent troops to Vietnam to give support to the people of South Vietnam in their crucial battle against the invaders from the north. It is absolutely true, of course, that we have to have an aid program for South Vietnam, and the President has taken

the leadership personally in emphasizing its importance. This could hardly have been stressed more than he did in his speech at Johns Hopkins University last year and in his trip to Honolulu a few weeks ago.

I have not heard that it has been specifically proposed that the United Nations should operate all of our aid programs in Vietnam in the midst of the fighting that is going on, and I doubt that anyone will go that far. At the same time, I do not believe that it is being advocated that these programs be abolished. We all know that only if these programs are successful will there be any lasting victory for the free world in Vietnam.

Thus, the logic of these ideas leads clearly to the abandonment of our efforts there, because the United Nations could never be brought to accept responsibility for administering foreign aid programs under the circumstances which exist there now and will certainly exist for some time to come. In other words, we could not accept the proposal without withdrawing our troops from South Vietnam. Even if we did that, there would be no assurance that any agency of this nature would be permitted to operate in South Vietnam; that would be something for the Communists in Hanoi and Peking to decide.

We are fighting to prevent them from forcing their decisions upon the people of South Vietnam, and we are firmly determined to win that fight. There are many ways of abandoning the people there, and the proposal would do exactly that, or so it seems to me. I hope the committee will reject it. If it is approved, I wish to serve notice that I shall be in the forefront of those who will undoubtedly oppose it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have been interested in the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, with emphasis on the multilateral phases of aid as proposed in the aid program. That is different from unilateral aid, as when the United States gives aid on its own or of its own agreement with an individual country. Then it is just between the two of them.

I am sympathetic with what the Senator has said. The Senator has been of service in pointing out some of the things that could happen as a result of changing our policy if it should be changed to a so-called multilateral aid program.

The Senator from Louisiana has pointed out very reasonably that most of these countries do not care anything about American interests. If they receive American aid in a multilateral agency, they will use it to their advantage in that area. Any forward looking advantages that the United States might hope for by way of real accomplishment in the interests of the people to be served would be lost.

The Senator also pointed out that under these proposals a great deal of American money would be channeled

into Communist hands or the hands of other nations whose activities are completely subversive to those of the United States. It is difficult for me to comprehend how we can swallow that doctrine completely.

The Senator and I have been members of the Foreign Relations Committee for quite some time. The Senator knows that I have supported a certain amount of flexibility in participation with other nations. My support has been motivated in great part by the hope that by such participation in some of these activities, some of the counties involved would do more on their own and relieve us of some of the burden in these areas. But it does not seem to work that way. The same situation prevails: We put up the money and they have the fun of spending it. And as a rule they receive the credit for it, rather than our receiving the credit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, our foreign aid program was originally envisioned as a program to advance the cause that we considered to be in the interest of the United States. One of the principal purposes of the program was to help nations to maintain their independence. But there were many other aspects that we felt were important. One of these aspects, for which the Senator from Iowa and I fought hard for a number of years, bears the name of "the Hickenlooper amendment." If we are putting our aid money by the hundreds of millions into a country to help assist that country with its problems, we will just have to stop putting the money in and hold it up, if they insist on confiscating honest, legitimate, good faith American investments that exist in that country. If we are attempting to help a country get on its feet, and meanwhile that country seems to go the route of nationalization without compensation—which is nothing but confiscation—the money is held up until they stop these activities and straighten out this situation.

How long do Senators think that principle would survive, once the matter is turned over to the United Nations or to some other international body?

If a large amount of Communist influence were not present in such a situation, then the majority of countries would be the so-called less developed nations. They would stand together on the principle. Whenever a large nation, like the United States, which is in the minority in the international bodies, wished to withhold money because a country was nationalizing American interests, do Senators not believe that the less developed nations would stand together against the principle involved, the Hickenlooper amendment, for which the Senator from Iowa and I have fought for many years? The purpose of the amendment was to help those countries build themselves up in an honest fashion; and if a country became an international bandit, we would not give it any money.

These people would band together and say, "If this is going to be a multilateral body, we will not agree with that." If one of these nations is confiscating American assets, we would cut off the supply of money.









Public Law 89-435  
89th Congress, H. R. 14215  
May 31, 1966

An Act

80 STAT. 170

Making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, namely:

Department of  
the Interior and  
Related Agencies  
Appropriation  
Act, 1967.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, and performance of other functions, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, \$48,855,000.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE

For acquisition, construction and maintenance of buildings, appurtenant facilities, and other improvements, and maintenance of access roads, \$3,032,000, to remain available until expended.

PUBLIC LANDS DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended. 72 Stat. 906.

OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of rights-of-way and of existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such lands; an amount equivalent to 25 per centum of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the amount appropriated herein for the purposes of this appropriation on lands administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein for road construction on lands other than those administered by the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce: *Provided further*, That the amount appropriated herein is hereby made a reimbursable charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and



43 USC 1181f.

shall be reimbursed to the general fund in the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876).

#### RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

48 Stat. 1270;  
61 Stat. 790.

49 Stat. 1978.

3 CFR 1954-1958  
Comp., p. 424.

For construction, purchase, and maintenance of range improvements pursuant to the provisions of sections 3 and 10 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315), sums equal to the aggregate of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, as range improvements fees under section 3 of said Act, 25 per centum of all moneys received, during the current fiscal year, under section 15 of said Act, and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive Order 10787, dated November 6, 1958, to remain available until expended.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

43 USC 1181f.

Appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management shall be available for purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft for replacement only; purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures; and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title: *Provided*, That of appropriations herein made for the Bureau of Land Management expenditures in connection with the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands (other than expenditures made under the appropriation "Oregon and California grant lands") shall be reimbursed from the 25 per centum referred to in subsection (c), title II, of the Act approved August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 876), of the special fund designated the "Oregon and California land-grant fund" and section 4 of the Act approved May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 754), of the special fund designated the "Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund": *Provided further*, That appropriations herein made may be expended on a reimbursable basis for (1) surveys of lands other than those under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management and (2) protection and leasing of lands and mineral resources for the State of Alaska.

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

##### EDUCATION AND WELFARE SERVICES

For expenses necessary to provide education and welfare services for Indians, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations, including payment (in advance or from date of admission), of care, tuition, assistance, and other expenses of Indians in boarding homes, institutions, or schools; grants and other assistance to needy Indians; maintenance of law and order, and payment of rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law on Indian reservations or lands; and operation of Indian arts and crafts shops; \$114,690,300: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$85,000 of this appropriation shall be made available to the San Carlos Apache Indian Tribe for maintenance of law and order.

##### RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for management, development, improvement and protection of resources and appurtenant facilities under the juris-

diction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including payment of irrigation assessments and charges; acquisition of water rights; advances for Indian industrial and business enterprises; operation of Indian arts and crafts shops and museums; and development of Indian arts and crafts, as authorized by law; \$44,086,000.

#### CONSTRUCTION

For construction, major repair, and improvement of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities; acquisition of lands and interests in lands; preparation of lands for farming; and architectural and engineering services by contract; \$56,118,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used for the acquisition of land within the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, New Mexico, South Dakota, and Utah outside of the boundaries of existing Indian reservations except lands authorized by law to be acquired for the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington either inside or outside the boundaries of existing reservations except such lands as may be required for replacement of the Wild Horse Dam in the State of Nevada: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be available for the construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$468,000 shall be for assistance to the Maddock, North Dakota, Public School District No. 9 for construction of a public high school.

#### ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, \$16,889,000, to remain available until expended. 72 Stat. 906.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the general administration of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, including such expenses in field offices, \$4,623,000.

#### TRIBAL FUNDS

In addition to the tribal funds authorized to be expended by existing law, there is hereby appropriated \$3,000,000 from tribal funds not otherwise available for expenditure for the benefit of Indians and Indian tribes, including pay and travel expenses of employees; care, tuition, and other assistance to Indian children attending public and private schools (which may be paid in advance or from date of admission); purchase of land and improvements on land, title to which shall be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the tribe for which purchased; lease of lands and water rights; compensation and expenses of attorneys and other persons employed by Indian tribes under approved contracts; pay, travel, and other expenses of tribal officers, councils, and committees thereof, or other tribal organizations, including mileage for use of privately owned automobiles and per diem in lieu of subsistence at rates established administratively but not to exceed those applicable to civilian employees of the Government; relief of Indians, without regard to section 7 of the Act of May 27, 1930 (46 Stat. 391), including cash grants; and employment of a curator for the Osage Museum, who shall be appointed with the

approval of the Osage Tribal Council and without regard to the classification laws: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount appropriated herein, tribal funds may be advanced to Indian tribes during the current fiscal year for such purposes as may be designated by the governing body of the particular tribe involved and approved by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That funds derived from appropriation in satisfaction of awards of the Indian Claims Commission and the Court of Claims shall not be available for advances, except for such amounts as may be necessary to pay attorney fees, expenses of litigation, and expenses of program planning, until after legislation has been enacted that sets forth the purposes for which said funds will be used: *Provided, however*, That no part of this appropriation or other tribal funds shall be used for the acquisition of land or water rights within the States of Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, either inside or outside the boundaries of existing Indian reservations, if such acquisition results in the property being exempted from local taxation, except as provided for by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 627).

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs (except the revolving fund for loans) shall be available for expenses of exhibits; purchase of not to exceed ninety-three passenger motor vehicles (including thirty-five for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year), of which seventy shall be for replacement only, which may be used for the transportation of Indians; advance payments for service (including services which may extend beyond the current fiscal year) under contracts executed pursuant to the Act of June 4, 1936 (25 U.S.C. 452), the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 986), and legislation terminating Federal supervision over certain Indian tribes; and expenses required by continuing or permanent treaty provisions.

49 Stat. 1458.  
77 Stat. 471;  
79 Stat. 74.  
25 USC 309, 309a.

#### BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, not otherwise provided for, \$3,910,000.

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), including \$2,560,000 for administrative expenses of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation during the current fiscal year, and acquisition of land or waters or interests therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the State or Federal agency concerned, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, established by section 2 of said Act, and to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$110,000,000 of which (1) not to exceed \$65,703,000 shall be available for payments to the States to be matched by the individual States with an equal amount; (2) not to exceed \$23,471,500 shall be available to the National Park Service; (3) not to exceed \$18,093,000 shall be available to the Forest Service; and (4) not to exceed \$172,500 shall be available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: *Provided* That in the event the receipts available in the Land and Water Conservation Fund are insufficient to provide the full amounts specified herein, the amounts available under clauses (1) through (4) shall be reduced proportionately.

16 USC 4601-4  
note.



## OFFICE OF TERRITORIES

## ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C., secs. 1422, 1661(c)) ; salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, the Government Comptroller, and the members of the immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1591, 72 Stat. 1095) ; compensation and mileage of members of the legislature in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. sec. 1661(c)) ; compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)) ; grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; loans and grants to Guam, as authorized by law (Public Law 88-170) ; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of Guam and American Samoa; \$10,513,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary.

64 Stat. 386;

45 Stat. 1253.

68 Stat. 503.

77 Stat. 302.

## TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

For expenses necessary for the Department of the Interior in administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands pursuant to the Trusteeship Agreement approved by joint resolution of July 18, 1947 (61 Stat. 397), and the Act of June 30, 1954 (68 Stat. 330), as amended (76 Stat. 171), including the expenses of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; compensation and expenses of the Judiciary of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; grants to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in addition to local revenues, for support of governmental functions; \$17,494,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the Trust Territory, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or utilized by such Trust Territory, shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 23), as amended, and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 834) : *Provided further*, That the government of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary in carrying out the provisions of article 6(2) of the Trusteeship Agreement approved by Congress.

61 Stat. 3301.

78 Stat. 601.

48 USC 1681

and notes.

31 USC 1.

31 USC 65 note.

## ALASKA RAILROAD

## ALASKA RAILROAD REVOLVING FUND

The Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund shall continue available until expended for the work authorized by law, including operation and maintenance of oceangoing or coastwise vessels by ownership, charter, or arrangement with other branches of the Government service, for the purpose of providing additional facilities for transportation of freight, passengers, or mail, when deemed necessary for the benefit and development of industries or travel in the area served; and payment of compensation and expenses as authorized by section 42 of the Act of September 7, 1916 (5 U.S.C. 793), to be reimbursed as therein provided: *Provided*, That no employee shall be paid an annual salary out of said fund in excess of the salaries prescribed by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, for grade GS-15, except the general manager of said railroad, one assistant general manager at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for GS-17, and five officers at not to exceed the salaries prescribed by said Act for grade GS-16.

39 Stat. 750.

79 Stat. 1111.

5 USC 1113.

## MINERAL RESOURCES

## GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

## SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its Territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by law (72 Stat. 837 and 76 Stat. 427); classify lands as to mineral character and water and power resources; give engineering supervision to power permits and Federal Power Commission licenses; enforce departmental regulations applicable to oil, gas, and other mining leases, permits, licenses, and operating contracts; control the interstate shipment of contraband oil as required by law (15 U.S.C. 715); administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); and publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; \$80,032,000, of which \$12,950,000 shall be available only for cooperation with States or municipalities for water resources investigations, and \$216,000 shall remain available until expended, to provide financial assistance to participants in minerals exploration projects, as authorized by law (30 U.S.C. 641-646), including administration of contracts entered into prior to June 30, 1958, under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of any topographic mapping or water resources investigations carried on in cooperation with any State, or municipality.

5 USC 485 note;  
43 USC 31.49 Stat. 30.  
72 Stat. 700.65 Stat. 133.  
50 USC app. 2093.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed forty-six passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the

making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations and observation wells; expenses of U.S. National Committee on Geology; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts.

## BUREAU OF MINES

### CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; \$34,740,000.

### HEALTH AND SAFETY

For expenses necessary for promotion of health and safety in mines and in the minerals industries, and controlling fires in coal deposits, as authorized by law; \$9,390,000.

### SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the Secretary of the Interior under the Solid Waste Disposal Act, \$4,300,000, to remain available until expended.

79 Stat. 997.  
42 USC 3251  
note.

### APPALACHIAN REGION MINING AREA RESTORATION

For expenses necessary in carrying out a nationwide study of strip and surface mine rehabilitation and reclamation, and a program of mining area restoration, as authorized by section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, \$7,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purchase, or for sharing in the cost of purchase, of lands or interests therein.

79 Stat. 13.  
40 USC app.  
205.

### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Mines; \$1,556,000.

### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Mines may be expended for purchase of not to exceed seventy-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Mines is authorized, during the current fiscal year, to sell directly or through any Government agency, including corporations, any metal or mineral product that may be manufactured in pilot plants operated by the Bureau of Mines, and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.



80 STAT. 177

## HELIUM FUND

74 Stat. 923.  
50 USC 167j.

The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury for payment to the helium production fund pursuant to section 12(a) of the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to carry out the provisions of the Act and contractual obligations thereunder, including helium purchases, to remain available without fiscal year limitation, \$26,000,000, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be borrowed.

## OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

30 USC 661-668.

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), \$8,220,000 to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$367,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

## OFFICE OF OIL AND GAS

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary to discharge his responsibilities with respect to oil and gas, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and its products, and natural gas, \$722,000.

## BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources, including whales, sea lions, and related aquatic plants and products; collection, compilation, and publication of information concerning such resources; promotion of education and training of fishery personnel; and the performance of other functions related thereto, as authorized by law; \$20,701,000, and in addition, \$1,000,000 to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

## MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

## (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as authorized by law, \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations to such agency, for payments in the foregoing currencies.

## CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required for the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of commercial fishery resources and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, \$1,245,000, to remain available until expended.

## CONSTRUCTION OF FISHING VESSELS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of June 12, 1960 (74 Stat. 212), as amended by the Act of August 30, 1964 (78 Stat. 614), to assist in the construction of fishing vessels, \$3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

46 USC 1401-1413.

## FEDERAL AID FOR COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

## RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 197), \$4,710,000, of which not to exceed \$210,000 shall be available for program administration and \$400,000 shall be available until expended pursuant to the provisions of section 4(b) of the Act: *Provided*, That the sum of \$4,100,000 available for apportionment to the States pursuant to section 5(a) of the Act shall remain available until the close of the fiscal year following the year for which appropriated.

16 USC 779 note.

## ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000.

16 USC 757a-757f.

## GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$739,000.

## ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of February 26, 1944, as amended (16 U.S.C. 631a-631q), there are appropriated amounts not to exceed \$2,468,000, to be derived from the Pribilof Islands fund.

58 Stat. 100.

## LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FISHERIES LOAN FUND

During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$309,000 of the Fisheries loan fund shall be available for administrative expenses.

## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries shall be available for purchase of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles, of which seventeen shall be for replacement only (including one for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year); purchase of one replacement aircraft; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$3 per man per day; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; and maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigations of fishery resources.

34 Stat. 690.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
MANAGEMENT AND INVESTIGATIONS OF RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for scientific and economic studies, conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, except whales, seals, and sea lions, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources; operation of the industrial properties within the Crab Orchard National Wildlife Refuge (61 Stat. 770); and maintenance of the herd of long-horned cattle on the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; \$38,145,800.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, \$7,118,600, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the unobligated balance remaining on June 30, 1966, of the appropriation granted under this head in the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1966, shall remain available until expended.

79 Stat. 184.

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACCOUNT

For an advance to the migratory bird conservation account, as authorized by the Act of October 4, 1961 (16 U.S.C. 715k-3, 5), \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

75 Stat. 813.

APPALACHIAN REGION FISH AND WILDLIFE RESTORATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary in carrying out a fish and wildlife restoration program, as authorized by section 205 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, \$500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for the purchase, or for sharing in the cost of purchase, of lands or interests therein.

79 Stat. 13.

40 USC app. 205.

ANADROMOUS AND GREAT LAKES FISHERIES CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of October 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 1125), \$2,675,000.

16 USC 757a-  
757f.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$1,549,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations and funds available to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife shall be available for purchase of not to exceed one hundred and twenty-three passenger motor vehicles, of which one hundred and thirteen are for replacement only (including sixty-three for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year); purchase of not to exceed five aircraft, for replacement only; not to exceed \$50,000 for



payment, in the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; publication and distribution of bulletins as authorized by law (7 U.S.C. 417); rations or commutation of rations for officers and crews of vessels at rates not to exceed \$3 per man per day; insurance on official motor vehicles, aircraft and boats operated by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in foreign countries; repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are not inconsistent with their primary purposes; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and to which the United States has title, and which are utilized pursuant to law in connection with management and investigation of fish and wildlife resources. 34 Stat. 690.

### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

#### MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION

For expenses necessary for the management and protection of the areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service, including protection of lands in process of condemnation; plans, investigations, and studies of the recreational resources (exclusive of preparation of detail plans and working drawings) and archeological values in river basins of the United States (except the Missouri River Basin); and not to exceed \$88,000 for the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission, \$35,932,800.

#### MAINTENANCE AND REHABILITATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

For expenses necessary for the operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of roads (including furnishing special road maintenance service to trucking permittees on a reimbursable basis), trails, buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities essential to the operation of areas administered pursuant to law by the National Park Service, \$26,680,000.

#### CONSTRUCTION

For construction and improvement, without regard to the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended (16 U.S.C. 451), of buildings, utilities, and other physical facilities; the repair or replacement of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, or storm, or the construction of projects deferred by reason of the use of funds for such purposes; and the acquisition of water rights; \$22,894,000, to remain available until expended. 37 Stat. 460; 54 Stat. 36.

#### PARKWAY AND ROAD CONSTRUCTION (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein 72 Stat. 906.

provided shall be expended for planning or construction on the following: Fort Washington and Greenbelt Park, Maryland, and Great Falls Park, Virginia, except minor roads and trails; and Daingerfield Island Marina, Virginia, and extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway from vicinity of Brickyard Road to Great Falls, Maryland, or in Prince Georges County, Maryland.

#### GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration of the National Park Service, including such expenses in the regional offices, \$2,562,000.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations for the National Park Service shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed one hundred and forty-one passenger motor vehicles of which one hundred and five shall be for replacement only, including not to exceed seventy-seven for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year.

#### OFFICE OF SALINE WATER

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

75 Stat. 628.

For expenses necessary to carry out provisions of the Act of July 3, 1952, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951-1958), authorizing studies of the conversion of saline water for beneficial consumptive uses, to remain available until expended, \$27,500,000, of which not to exceed \$1,445,000, shall be available for administration and coordination during the current fiscal year.

#### OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

72 Stat. 1706.

For operation and maintenance of demonstration plants for the production of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, as authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended, (42 U.S.C. 1958a-1958g), \$2,351,000, of which not to exceed \$206,000 shall be available for administration.

#### OFFICE OF WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

42 USC 1961 note.

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 329), \$6,894,000, of which not to exceed \$431,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 USC 1001 note.

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, \$4,704,000, and in addition, not to exceed \$152,000 may be reimbursed or transferred to this appropriation from other accounts available to the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That hereafter hearing officers appointed for Indian probate work need not be appointed pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act (60 Stat. 237), as amended.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, including teletype rentals and service, and not to exceed \$2,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$4,998,900.

GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

Emergency re-  
construction.

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this title for fire suppression purposes shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft or other equipment in connection with their use for fire suppression purposes, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof.

Forest or  
range fires.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

Operation of  
warehouses, etc.

47 Stat. 417.

SEC. 104. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title or in the Public Works Appropriations Act, 1967, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed \$200,000; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

Employment of  
experts, etc.

60 Stat. 810.

SEC. 105. Appropriations available to the Department of the Interior for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131 and D.C. Code 4-204).

Uniforms or  
allowances.

68 Stat. 1114;  
79 Stat. 1122;  
43 Stat. 175.



## TITLE II—RELATED AGENCIES

## DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

## FOREST SERVICE

## FOREST PROTECTION AND UTILIZATION

For expenses necessary for forest protection and utilization, as follows:

Forest land management: For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, including the administration, improvement, development, and management of lands under Forest Service administration, fighting and preventing forest fires on or threatening such lands and for liquidation of obligations incurred in the preceding fiscal year for such purposes, control of white pine blister rust and other forest diseases and insects on Federal and non-Federal lands; \$173,850,000, of which \$5,000,000 for fighting and preventing forest fires and \$1,910,000 for insect and disease control shall be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to the extent necessary under the then existing conditions: *Provided*, That not more than \$2,480,000 of this appropriation may be used for acquisition of land under the Act of March 1, 1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519): *Provided further*, That funds appropriated for "Cooperative range improvements", pursuant to section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), may be advanced to this appropriation.

31 USC 665.

36 Stat. 962.

64 Stat. 85.

Forest research: For forest research at forest and range experiment stations, the Forest Products Laboratory, or elsewhere, as authorized by law; \$37,821,000.

State and private forestry cooperation: For cooperation with States in forest-fire prevention and suppression, in forest tree planting on non-Federal public and private lands, and in forest management and processing, and for advising timberland owners, associations, wood-using industries, and others in the application of forest management principles and processing of forest products, as authorized by law; \$17,897,000.

## FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, sections 203 and 205, relating to the construction and maintenance of forest development roads and trails, \$101,230,000, to remain available until expended, for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority contained in title 23, United States Code, section 203: *Provided*, That funds available under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501), shall be merged with and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not less than the amount made available under the provisions of the Act of March 4, 1913, shall be expended under the provisions of such Act.

72 Stat. 906.

37 Stat. 843.

## ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of land to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating within the exterior boundaries of the following national forests, in accordance with the provisions of the following Acts, authorizing annual appropriations of forest receipts for such purposes, and in not to exceed the following amounts from

such receipts, Cache National Forest, Utah, Act of May 11, 1938 (52 Stat. 347), as amended, \$20,000; Uinta and Wasatch National Forests, Utah, Act of August 26, 1935 (49 Stat. 866), as amended, \$20,000; Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada, Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1205), as amended, \$8,000; Sequoia National Forest, California, Act of June 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 402), \$32,000; in all, \$80,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for acquisition of any land which is not within the boundaries of the national forests and/or for the acquisition of any land without the approval of the local government concerned. 58 Stat. 227.

#### ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR UINTA NATIONAL FOREST

For the acquisition of land in the Uinta National Forest, Utah, in accordance with the Act of October 1, 1965 (79 Stat. 899), \$300,000, to remain available until expended.

#### COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests in accordance with section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (16 U.S.C. 580h), to be derived from grazing fees as authorized by said section, \$700,000, to remain available until expended. 64 Stat. 85.

#### ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR TREE PLANTING

For expenses necessary to carry out section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, approved May 28, 1956 (16 U.S.C. 568e), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended. 70 Stat. 207.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, FOREST SERVICE

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (a) purchase of not to exceed one hundred and sixty-five passenger motor vehicles of which one hundred and fifteen shall be for replacement only, and hire of such vehicles; operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four for replacement only; (b) employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), and not to exceed \$25,000 for employment under section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); (c) uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); (d) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (5 U.S.C. 565a); (e) expenses of the National Forest Reservation Commission as authorized by section 14 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (16 U.S.C. 514); and (f) acquisition of land and interests therein for sites for administrative purposes, pursuant to the Act of August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 428a). Passenger motor vehicles, etc., funds available. 58 Stat. 742. 60 Stat. 810. 68 Stat. 1114; 79 Stat. 1122. 58 Stat. 742. 36 Stat. 963. 70 Stat. 1034.

Except to provide materials required in or incident to research or experimental work where no suitable domestic product is available, no part of the funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be expended in the purchase of twine manufactured from commodities or materials produced outside of the United States.

Funds appropriated under this Act shall not be used for acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1,

36 Stat. 962.

1911, as amended (16 U.S.C. 513-519, 521), where such land is not within the boundaries of an established national forest or purchase unit.

#### FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

60 Stat. 810.

For necessary expenses of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$61,400.

#### COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

36 Stat. 371.

For expenses made necessary by the Act establishing a Commission of Fine Arts (40 U.S.C. 104), including payment of actual traveling expenses of the members and secretary of the Commission in attending meetings and Committee meetings of the Commission either within or outside the District of Columbia, to be disbursed on vouchers approved by the Commission, \$115,000.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

##### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

##### INDIAN HEALTH ACTIVITIES

42 USC 2001-  
2004a.

For expenses necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), as amended; purchase of not to exceed sixteen passenger motor vehicles, of which twelve shall be for replacement only; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the purposes set forth in sections 301 (with respect to research conducted at facilities financed by this appropriation), 321, 322(d), 324, and 509 of the Public Health Service Act; \$73,671,000.

42 USC 241, 248,  
249, 251, 227.

##### CONSTRUCTION OF INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

73 Stat. 267.

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a); \$13,464,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such expenditures during the current or any subsequent fiscal year may, at the option of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, be made by the Department of the Interior as contracting agent.

##### OFFICE OF EDUCATION

##### ARTS AND HUMANITIES EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

79 Stat. 854.  
20 USC 961, 962.

For carrying out sections 12 and 13 of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, \$1,000,000.



## ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations contained in this Act, available for salaries and expenses, shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a). Employment of experts.  
60 Stat. 810.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131). Uniforms or allowances.  
68 Stat. 1114;  
79 Stat. 1122.

Appropriations contained in this Act available for salaries and expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance at meetings which are concerned with the functions or activities for which the appropriation is made or which will contribute to improved conduct, supervision, or management of those functions or activities. Attendance at meetings.

## INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act of August 13, 1946 (25 U.S.C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, \$382,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for expenses of travel. 60 Stat. 1049.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by the National Capital Planning Act of 1952 (40 U.S.C. 71-71i), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); \$1,005,000. 66 Stat. 781.

## NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of title II of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 537), including payment in advance for membership in societies whose publications or services are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); \$1,400,000. 40 USC 661-665.

## CONSTRUCTION, RAIL RAPID TRANSIT SYSTEM

For expenses necessary to design, engineer, construct, and equip a rail rapid transit system, as authorized by the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, including acquisition of rights of way, land and interests therein, \$9,055,000, to remain available until expended. 79 Stat. 663.  
40 USC 681 note.

## NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, including functions under Public Law 88-579, to remain available until expended, \$9,000,000, of which \$4,000,000 shall be available for carrying out section 5(c); \$2,000,000 for carrying out section 7(c); and \$2,000,000 for carrying 79 Stat. 845.  
20 USC 951  
note.  
78 Stat. 905.  
20 USC 781 note.

79 Stat. 847.  
20 USC 954.

out section 5(h) of the Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, there is appropriated for the purposes of section 11(b) of the Act, an amount equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests and devises of money, and other property received by the Endowments, during the current fiscal year, under the provisions of section 10(a) (2) of the Act, but not to exceed \$2,000,000 for the Endowment for the Arts, and \$3,000,000 for the Endowment for the Humanities, less the amounts respectively appropriated to such Endowments for the purposes of section 11(b) in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1966: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated pursuant to this paragraph may be used for any grant or other payment which is to be used directly or indirectly for the destruction of the Metropolitan Opera House in New York City.

79 Stat. 1140.

#### PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

78 Stat. 982.  
43 USC 1391-  
1400.  
60 Stat. 810.

For necessary expenses of the Public Land Law Review Commission, established by Public Law 88-606, approved September 19, 1964, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representation expenses, \$907,000, to remain available until expended.

#### SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

68 Stat. 1114;  
79 Stat. 1122.

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, including research; preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from Government and other sources; international exchanges; anthropological researches; maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts and the National Portrait Gallery; including not to exceed \$35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), for other employees; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publications; \$22,523,000.

#### ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH AND EXCAVATION (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

72 Stat. 275.

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses for carrying out museum programs and related research in the natural sciences and cultural history under the provisions of section 104(k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704k), \$2,316,000, to remain available until expended and to be available only to United States institutions: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations to Smithsonian Institution, for payments in the foregoing currencies.

## CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, NATIONAL ZOOLOGICAL PARK

For necessary expenses of planning, construction, remodeling, and equipping of buildings and facilities at the National Zoological Park, \$1,589,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such portion of this amount as may be necessary may be transferred to the District of Columbia (20 U.S.C. 81-84; 75 Stat. 779).

26 Stat. 78;  
28 Stat. 384;  
37 Stat. 437.

## RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of restoration and renovation of buildings owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), including not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$2,300,000, to remain available until expended.

20 USC 53a.  
60 Stat. 810.

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

For the upkeep and operation of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator operators and uniforms, or allowances therefor for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); purchase, or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and not to exceed \$15,000 for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper; \$2,718,000.

53 Stat. 577.  
20 USC 71-75.  
  
68 Stat. 1114;  
79 Stat. 1122.

## CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of August 5, 1953 (67 Stat. 366), as amended, \$25,000.

36 USC 426.

## LEWIS AND CLARK TRAIL COMMISSION

## SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission, established by Public Law 88-630, approved October 6, 1964, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$25,000.

78 Stat. 1005.



## FEDERAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING COMMITTEES FOR ALASKA

For necessary expenses of the Federal Development Planning Committees for Alaska, established by Executive Order 11182 of October 2, 1964, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) \$190,000.

3 CFR 1964 Supp.,  
p. 194.  
60 Stat. 810.

## FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT MEMORIAL COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, established by the Act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 694), \$80,000, to remain available until expended.

## GENERAL PROVISIONS, RELATED AGENCIES

SEC. 202. The per diem rate paid from appropriations made available under this title for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) or other law, shall not exceed \$83.

## TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

Short title.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1967."

Approved May 31, 1966.

---

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 1405 (Comm. on Appropriations) and No. 1538 (Comm. of Conference).

SENATE REPORT No. 1154 (Comm. on Appropriations).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 112 (1966):

Apr. 5: Considered in House.

Apr. 6: Considered and passed House.

May 12: Considered and passed Senate, amended.

May 18: House agreed to conference report.

May 19: Senate agreed to conference report.



